



num. 985 - 5

held

S

<36632194380018

<36632194380018

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

vol. 985 - 5


held

<36632194380018


<36632194380018

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

S




Church Historical Society.



Established for the publication and registration
of Church Histories, &c., 1847.

Ecclesiastical History Society.



Established for the publication and republication
of Church Histories, &c., 1847.

OF THE CHURCH,

FIVE BOOKS.


BY

RICHARD FIELD, D.D.,

DEAN OF GLOUCESTER.

VOL. III.

CONTAINING THE FIFTH BOOK TO THE END OF THE
FORTY-SEVENTH CHAPTER.



CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,
FOR
The Ecclesiastical History Society.

M.DCCC.L.

OF THE CHURCH
THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

FIVE BOOKS

BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS

THE EPISTLE TO THE READER.

AS in the days of Noe they all perished in the waters that entered not into the ark prepared by God's own appointment, for the preservation of such as should escape that fearful and almost universal destruction: so is it a most certain and undoubted truth, good Christian reader, that none can fly from the wrath to come, and attain desired happiness, but such as enter into that society of men which we call the Church, which is the chosen multitude of them whom God hath separated from the rest of the world, and to whom he hath in more special sort manifested himself by the knowledge of revealed truth, than to any other. So that nothing is more necessary to be sought out and known, than which, and where this happy society of holy ones is, that so we may join ourselves to the same, and inherit the promises made unto it; according to that of the holy patriarch Noe: "Blessed be the God of Sem, and let Chanaan be his servant; the Lord persuade Japhet to dwell in the tents of Sem¹." The consideration whereof moved me, when I was to enter into the controversies of these times, first and before all other things, carefully to seek out the nature and being of this Church, the notes whereby it may be known, which it is amongst all the societies of men in the world, and what the privileges are that do belong unto it; of all which things I have treated in those four books of that argument, which not long since I offered to thy view and censure. Now it remaineth that in this ensuing Book then promised, I show in what sort Almighty God, who sitteth between the cherubims in this his holy temple, revealeth himself from off the mercy seat to such as by the calling of grace he hath caused to approach and draw near unto himself, and how he guideth and directeth them, to the attaining of eternal felicity. Many and sundry ways did God reveal himself in ancient times, as it is in the epistle to the Hebrews². For sometimes he manifested himself to men waking, by visions; sometimes to men sleeping, by dreams; sometimes he appeared in a pillar of a cloud; sometimes in flaming fire; sometimes he came walking a soft pace among the trees of the garden, in the cool of the day; sometimes he rent the rocks, and clave the mountains in sunder; sometimes he

¹ Gen. ix. 26, 7.

² Hebr. i. 1.

spake with a still and soft voice ; sometimes his thunders shook the pillars of heaven, and made the earth to tremble, as in the giving of the law, when he came down upon mount Sinai ; what time the people by Moses' direction went forth to meet him ; but when they heard the thunders, and the sound of the trumpet, and saw the lightnings, and the mountain smoking, they fled and stood afar off, and said unto Moses, "Talk thou with us, and we will hear thee ; but let not God talk with us, lest we die¹."

This their petition Almighty God mercifully granted, and knowing whereof they were made, resolved no more to speak unto them in so terrible and fearful manner, but rather to put heavenly treasures into earthen vessels, that is, to enlighten the understandings, and to sanctify the mouths and tongues of some amongst themselves, and by them to make known his will and pleasure to the rest. In this sort after the giving of the law he employed the priests and Levites in a set and ordinary course, appointing that the people should seek the knowledge of the same at their mouths ; and in case of great confusion, and general defects of these ordinary guides, raised up prophets, as well to denounce his judgments against offenders, and to reform abuses ; as also to foreshow the future state of things, and more and more to raise in men a desire, hope, and expectation of the coming of the promised Messiah, whom in the fulness of time he sent into the world as the happiest messenger of glad tidings, that ever came unto the sons of men, and the angel of the great covenant of peace, causing this proclamation to be made before him, "This is my well beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased ; hear him." In him were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, so that as it was said of him, "He hath done all things well," so likewise, that "never man spake as he spake." But because he came not into this lower world to make his abode here perpetually, but to carry up with him into heaven our desires first, and then ourselves ; after he had wrought all righteousness, and performed the work for which he came, he returned back to God that sent him ; choosing out some of them that had been conversant with him in the days of his flesh, that had heard the words of his divine wisdom, and were eye-witnesses of all the things he did and suffered ; and sending them as his Father sent him, who were therefore named apostles. These had many excellent pre-eminences, proper to those beginnings, and fit for the founding of Christian Churches ; as immediate calling, infallibility of judgment, general commission, the understanding and knowledge of all tongues, power to confirm their doctrine by signs and wonders, and to confer the miraculous gifts of the Spirit upon other

¹ Exod. xx. 19.

also, by the imposition of their hands. In which things, when they had finished their course, they left none to succeed them ; yet out of their more large, ample, and immediate commissions, they authorized others to preach the gospel, administer sacraments, to bind and loose, and to perform other like pastoral duties, sanctifying and ordaining them to this work, by the imposition of hands. These they honoured with the glorious title of presbyters, that is, fatherly guides of God's Church and people ; and knowing the weight of the burden they laid on their shoulders, added unto them as assistants other of an inferior degree and rank, whom they named deacons, or ministers. Amongst these fatherly guides of God's Church and people, for the preventing of dissension, the avoiding of confusion, and the more orderly managing of the important affairs of Almighty God, they established a most excellent, divine, and heavenly order, giving unto one amongst the presbyters of each Church an eminent and fatherly power, so that the rest might do nothing without him ; whom for distinction's sake, and to express the honour of his degree and place, afore and above other, we name a bishop. And farther, by a most wise disposition provided, that amongst bishops all should not challenge all things unto themselves, but that there should be in several provinces several bishops, who should be first and chief amongst the brethren ; and again constituted and placed certain other in greater cities, who might take care of more than the former. The former of these were named metropolitans, the later were known by the name of patriarchs, or chief fathers, who also in order and honour were one before and after another. By means of this order established by the apostles of Christ among the guides of God's people, and received and allowed by the first and primitive Christians, unity was preserved, the parts of the Church holden fast together, in a band of concordant agreement ; questions determined, doubts cleared, differences composed, and causes advisedly and deliberately heard, with all indifferency and equity. For how could there be any breach in the Christian Churches, when none were ordained presbyters in any Church, but by the bishop, the rest of the presbyters imposing their hands on them, together with him ? None admitted to the degree and order of a bishop, but by the metropolitan, and other bishops of the province, sufficiently approving that they did, to the people over which they set him ? None received as a metropolitan, unless being ordained by the bishops of the province upon notice given of their orderly proceeding, and the sincerity of his faith and profession, he were confirmed by the patriarch ? Nor none taken for a patriarch, though ordained by many neighbour bishops, till making known the soundness of his profession, and the lawfulness of his election and

ordination to the rest of the patriarchs, he were allowed and received by them as one of their rank and order? Or what fear could there be of any wrong, injustice, or sinister proceedings in the hearing of causes, and determining of controversies, unless there were in a sort a general failing? When if there grew a difference between a bishop and his presbyters, or if either presbyter, deacon, or inferior clergyman, disliked the proceedings of his bishop, there lay an appeal to the metropolitan, who had power to re-examine the matter in a synod, and to see they were not wronged? And if either clerk or bishop had ought against the metropolitan, it was lawful for them to appeal to the primate, or patriarch, who in a greater and more honourable synod, was to hear the matter, and to make a final end? When if any variance rose between any of the patriarchs and their bishops, or amongst themselves, it was lawful for the patriarchs that were above and before them, in order and honour, to interpose themselves, and with their synods to judge of such differences; and in such cases as could not so be ended, or that concerned the faith, and the state of the whole universal Church, there remained the judgment and resolution of a general council; wherein the bishop of the first see was to sit as president and moderator; and the other bishops of the Christian world, as his fellow judges, and in the same commission with him. This order continued in the Church from the apostles' times, and wrought excellent effects, till the bishop of Constantinople first sought, and after him the bishop of Rome obtained, to be not only in order and honour before the rest, as anciently he had been, but to have an absolute and universal commanding power over all, that either by fraud, or violence, he could bring into subjection. Whence followed horrible confusion in the Christian Church, and almost the utter ruin and desolation of the same. For after that this child of pride had in this Lucifer-like sort advanced himself above his brethren, he thrust his sickle into other men's harvests, he encroached upon their bounds and limits; he pretended a right to confer all dignities, whether elective or presentative, to receive appeals of all sorts of men, out of all parts of the world; nay, without appeal or complaint, immediately to take notice of all causes, in the dioceses of all other bishops: so overthrowing their jurisdiction, and seizing it in his own hands. He exempted presbyters from the jurisdiction of their bishops, bishops of their metropolitans, and metropolitans of their primates and patriarchs; and leaving unto the rest nothing but a naked and empty title, took upon him to determine all doubts and questions of himself alone, as out of the infallibility of his judgment; to excommunicate, degrade, and depose, and again, to absolve, reconcile, and restore, and to hear and

judge of all causes, as out of the fulness of his power. Neither did he there stay, but having subjected unto him, as much as in him lay, all the members of Christ's body, and trampled underneath his feet the honour and dignity of all his brethren and colleagues, he went forward, and challenged a right to dispose of all the kingdoms of the world, as being Lord of lords, and King of kings. To this height he raised himself by innumerable sleights and cunning devices, taking the advantage of the ignorance, superstition, negligence, and base disposition which he found to be in many of the guides of the Church in those days, and by their help and concurrence, prevailing against the rest that were of another spirit. Neither did he demean himself any better after he had attained to this his desired greatness; for such was his pride, insolency, and tyranny, and such, so many, and unsupportable were the burthens he laid on the shoulders of them that were no way able to bear them, that the voices of complaint and murmuring were everywhere heard, and the minds of all men filled with discontentment, and desire of alteration, which after many longing desires of our ancestors, hath been effected in our time: God, at the last, hearing the cries of his people, and stirring up the heroical spirits of his chosen servants, to work our deliverance, to take the burthens from our shoulders, the yoke from our neck, and to bring us out of that Babylon wherein we were captives, and that spiritual Egypt, wherein we were formerly holden in miserable bondage. But as there were some of the children of the captivity, that after long continuance abroad forgot Hierusalem, and preferred Babylon before Sion, never desiring to return into their own country any more: and as many of the Israelites brought out of the house of Pharaoh's bondage by God himself, and conducted by Moses and Aaron to take possession of Canaan, the land of promise, a land that flowed with milk and honey, in their hearts returned back: so are there many that never would be induced to come out of the spiritual Babylon; and other that are easily persuaded to look back, and in their hearts to return into Egypt again. For the winning and gaining of the former, and the staying of the latter, I have endeavoured by the true description of them out of the Scripture, and the authentical records of antiquity, to make it appear, how far Canaan exceedeth Egypt, and Sion Babylon, how different the government of Christ is from that of antichrist; how happy the people are that live under the one, and how miserable their condition is that are subject to the other.

Beseeching God for his mercy's sake to enlighten them that sit in darkness, to bring back them that are gone astray, to raise up

them that are fallen, to strengthen them that stand, to confirm
them that are doubtful, to rebuke Sathan, to put an end
to the manifold unhappy contentions of these
times, to make up the breaches of
Sion, to build the walls of
Hierusalem, and to
love it still.

R. F.

THE TABLE.

THE FIFTH BOOK IS CONCERNING THE DIVERS DEGREES,
ORDERS AND CALLINGS OF THOSE MEN TO WHOM
THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH IS
COMMITTED.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

OF the Primitive and first Church of God in the house of Adam,
the father of all the living; and the government of the
same 1

CHAPTER II.

Of the dignity of the firstborn amongst the sons of Adam, and
their kingly and priestly direction of the rest 3

CHAPTER III.

Of the division of the pre-eminences of the firstborn among
the sons of Jacob, when they came out of Egypt, and the
Church of God became national 5

CHAPTER IV.

Of the separation of Aaron and his sons from the rest of the
sons of Levi, to serve in the priest's office, and of the head
or chief of that company 6

CHAPTER V.

Of the priests of the second rank or order 10

CHAPTER VI.

Of the Levites 12

CHAPTER VII.

	PAGE
Of the sects and factions in religion, found amongst the Jews in latter times	13

CHAPTER VIII.

Of prophets and Nazarites	17
-------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER IX.

Of assemblies upon extraordinary occasions	20
--	----

CHAPTER X.

Of the set courts amongst the Jews; their authority and con- tinuance	23
--	----

CHAPTER XI.

Of the manifestation of God in the flesh, the causes thereof, and the reason why the second Person in the Trinity rather took flesh than either of the other	24
--	----

CHAPTER XII.

Of the manner of the union that is between the Person of the Son of God, and our nature in Christ, and the similitudes brought to express the same	48
--	----

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the communication of the properties of either nature in Christ, consequent upon the union of them in his Person, and the two first kinds thereof	56
---	----

CHAPTER XIV.

Of the third kind of communication of properties, and the first degree thereof	60
---	----

CHAPTER XV.

	PAGE
Of the third kind of communication of properties, and the second degree thereof	72

CHAPTER XVI.

Of the work of Mediation performed by Christ in our nature.	78
---	----

CHAPTER XVII.

Of the things which Christ suffered for us, to procure our reconciliation with God.	86
---	----

CHAPTER XVIII.

Of the nature and quality of the passion and suffering of Christ.	97
---	----

CHAPTER XIX.

Of the descending of Christ into hell.	105
--	-----

CHAPTER XX.

Of the merit of Christ: of his not meriting for himself, and his meriting for us.	134
---	-----

CHAPTER XXI.

Of the benefits which we receive from Christ.	145
---	-----

CHAPTER XXII.

Of the ministry of them to whom Christ committed the publishing of the reconciliation between God and men, procured by him.	149
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIII.

Of the primacy of power imagined by our adversaries to have been in Peter, and their defence of the same.	169
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIV.

	PAGE
Of the pre-eminence that Peter had amongst the apostles, and the reason why Christ directed his speeches specially to him.	183

CHAPTER XXV.

Of the distinction of them to whom the apostles dying left the managing of Church-affairs, and particularly of them that are to perform the meaner services in the Church.	187
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVI.

Of the orders and degrees of them that are trusted with the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and the government of God's people: and particularly of lay-elders, falsely by some supposed to be governors of the Church.	201
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVII.

Of the distinction of the power of Order and Jurisdiction, and the pre-eminence of one amongst the presbyters of each Church, who is named a bishop.	209
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Of the division of the lesser titles, and smaller congregations or Churches, out of those Churches of so large extent, founded and constituted by the apostles.	218
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIX.

Of chorepiscopi, or rural bishops, forbidden by old canons to encroach upon the episcopal office, and of the institution and necessary use of archpresbyters or deans.	227
--	-----

CHAPTER XXX.

Of the form of the government of the Church, and the institution and authority of metropolitans and patriarchs.	243
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXI.

	PAGE
Of patriarchs, who they were : and the reason why they were preferred before other bishops.	257

CHAPTER XXXII.

How the pope succeedeth Peter, what of right belongeth to him, and what it is that he unjustly claimeth.	264
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Of the proofs brought by the Romanists for confirmation of the universality of the pope's jurisdiction and power.	270
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Of the pretended proofs of the pope's universal jurisdiction, taken out of the decretal Epistles of popes.	279
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXV.

Of the pretended proofs of the pope's supremacy, produced and brought out of the writings of the Greek fathers.	302
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Of the pretended proofs of the pope's supremacy, taken out of the writings of the Latin fathers.	317
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Of the pretended proofs of the pope's universal power, taken from his intermeddling in ancient times, in confirming, deposing, or restoring bishops deposed.	344
--	-----

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Of the weakness of such proofs of the supreme power of popes, as are taken from their laws, censures, dispensations, and the vicegerents they had in places far remote from them.	359
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXIX.

Of appeals to Rome.	373
-----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XL.

	PAGE
Of the pope's supposed exemption from all human judgment, as being reserved to the judgment of Christ only.	397

CHAPTER XLI.

Of the titles given to the pope, and the insufficiency of the proofs of his illimited power and jurisdiction taken from them.	426
--	-----

CHAPTER XLII.

Of the second supposed privilege of the Roman bishops, which is infallibility of judgment.	433
---	-----

CHAPTER XLIII.

Of such popes as are charged with heresy, and how the Romanists seek to clear them from that imputation.	456
---	-----

CHAPTER XLIV.

Of the pope's unjust claim of temporal dominion over the whole world.	479
--	-----

CHAPTER XLV.

Of the pope's unjust claim to intermeddle with the affairs of princes, and their states, if not as sovereign lord over all, yet at least <i>in ordine ad Spiritualia</i> , and in case of princes failing to do their duties.	497
--	-----

CHAPTER XLVI.

Of the examples of churchmen deposing princes, brought by the Romanists.	519
---	-----

CHAPTER XLVII.

Of the civil dominion which the popes have by the gift of princes.	547
---	-----

THE FIFTH BOOK:

OF THE

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

THE BIBLE BOOK :

OF THE

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

BOOK V.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE PRIMITIVE AND FIRST CHURCH OF GOD IN THE HOUSE
OF ADAM THE FATHER OF ALL THE LIVING, AND THE GO-
VERNMENT OF THE SAME.

ALMIGHTY God, the fountain of all being, who to manifest the glory of his power and the riches of his goodness made all things of nothing, disposed and sorted the things he made into three several ranks. For to some he gave being, without any apprehension or discerning of it: others he made to feel, and sensibly discern that particular good he was pleased to do unto them: and to a third sort, of a more eminent degree and quality, made after his own image, he gave generality of knowledge of all things, and extent of desire answerable thereunto; causing them without all restraint or limitation to take view of all the variety of things that are in the world, and never to rest satisfied till they come to see, enjoy, and possess him that made them all.

These he separated from the rest of his creatures, causing them to approach and draw near unto himself, and to compass about his sacred throne, and called them forth to be a joyful company of blessed ones, praising and worshipping him in the glorious temple of the world, and to be unto him an holy Church, in the midst whereof his greatness should be known, and his name called upon. These are of two sorts: angels, dwelling in heavenly palaces; and men, made out of the earth, dwelling in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust. The angels are immortal, immaterial, and spiritual substances, made all at once; and immediately after their creation, so many as turned not from God their Creator, confirmed in grace, and perfectly established in the full possession of their uttermost good, so that they need no guide to lead them to the attaining of the same: howsoever, in the degrees of their natural or supernatural perfections, and in the actions of their

ministry wherein God employeth them, they are more great and excellent one than another, and are not without their order and government. But concerning men made out of the earth, and compounded of body and spirit, it is far otherwise: for God did not create them all at one time, but made only one man, and one woman, immediately with his own hands, appointing that the rest should descend and come of them by natural generation. Whereupon we shall find, that as in the creation the tree was first, and then the seed, but in the natural propagation of things the seed is first, and then the tree; so the first man whom God made out of the earth, and the first woman whom he made of man, were perfect at the first, as well in stature of body, as in qualities of the mind; (both because whatsoever is immediately from God is perfect, as also for that the first things¹ whence all other have their being, must be perfect;) but afterwards the beginnings of all the sons of men are weak, and they grow by degrees to perfection of body and mind, having need to receive nourishment, support, guidance, and direction, from them from whom they receive their being. So that nothing is more natural than for children to expect these things from their parents, nor for parents, than to nourish, guide, and direct their children. This care pertaineth as well to the mother that bare them, and in whose womb they were conceived, as to the father that begat them, and out of whose loins they came. Yet because the man was not of the woman, but the woman of the man, the man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man, the original disposition and sovereign direction of all doth naturally rest in the man, who is the glory of God, the woman's head, and every way fittest to be chief commander in the whole family and household. Hereupon Adam, the father of all the living, was appointed by that God that made him, to instruct, guide, and direct those that should come of him, even in the state of nature's integrity; though without any forcing with terrors, or recalling with punishments, while there was yet no proneness to evil,

¹ "Prima omnia perfecta sunt: cætera autem omnia, quæ ex ipsis oriuntur, et post ipsa sequuntur, nisi per intervalla temporum crescendo ad perfectionem venire non possunt."—Hugo citat. ab Alex. de Hales. Part. 2. Quæst. 89. Memb. 2. [Tom. i. p. 356. Col. Agr. 1622.]

nor difficulty to do good. And when he had broken the law of his Creator, was called to an account, made know his sin, and recomforted with the promise, that the seed of the woman should break the serpent's head, he was to teach his children the same things, and sanctified to be both a king, to rule in the little world of his own family, and a priest, as well to manifest the will of God to them of the same, as to present their desires, vows, and sacrifices unto him, than which course what could be devised more fitting? For when there were no more in the world but the first man whom God made out of the earth, the first woman that was made of man, and the children which God had given them, who could be fitter to rule and direct than the man for whose sake the woman was created, and out of whose loins the children came?

CHAPTER II.

OF THE DIGNITY OF THE FIRST-BORN AMONGST THE SONS OF ADAM, AND THEIR KINGLY AND PRIESTLY DIRECTION OF THE REST.

AND seeing nothing is more natural, than that as the father is to instruct, direct, and set forward the children that God hath given him, in the way of virtue and well-doing, so amongst the children the elder should help the younger, the stronger and more excellent the weaker and more mean; none could be fitter to assist him in the kingly and priestly office, while he lived, and to succeed him in the same when he died, than the first-born, "the beginning of strength, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power¹." And hereupon we shall find, that from the beginning the first-born excelled the rest in three things. For, first, he was lord over his brethren, according to that of Isaac, blessing Jacob the younger instead of the elder, and thereby preferring him to the dignity of the first-born: "Be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's children bow down unto thee²;" secondly, he had a double portion; and thirdly, he was holy unto God; which dignity as it belonged formerly even from the beginning to the first-born, as being most worthy and excellent, so was

¹ Gen. xlix. 3.

² Gen. xxvii. 29.

it confirmed¹, when God, striking all the first-born in Egypt, spared the first-born of the Israelites. This pre-eminence of the first-born continued, the eldest ever succeeding in the kingly and priestly office, unless for impiety or cause best known to God he were rejected by him, till the time that Israel came out of Egypt, and the Church of God became national. For then, according to the tenor of Jacob's blessing², these privileges were divided. Judah had the sceptre, Levi the priesthood, and Joseph the double portion, in that two of his sons, Ephraim and Manasses, became patriarchs and heads of tribes, and had equal inheritance in the land of promise with the sons of Jacob. So that in the societies of faithful and holy ones, from the first man that God made, till Aaron was sanctified to be a priest unto God instead of the first-born, the eldest always (unless for impiety, or other cause best known to God, he were rejected by him,) had the kingly and priestly direction of the rest. So when Cain the eldest son of Adam, and first that was born of a woman, to whom the dignity of the first-born did pertain, was for his impiety rejected from that honour, and Abel, who by faith offered a better sacrifice than he, was slain by him, God raised up Seth³, who being taught by Adam his father touching the creation, the fall, the punishments of sin, and the promised Saviour, assisted him while he lived in guiding the people and Church of God, and succeeded him in the same government after his death. In like sort Enos⁴ assisted and succeeded Seth, and dying left that honour to Kenan: Kenan to Mahalaleel: Mahalaleel to Jared: Jared, surviving Enoch his son, whom God translated, left it to Methuselah: Methuselah to Lamech the father of Noe; in whose time the children of God, that is, the posterity of Seth, marrying with the daughters of men, that is, such as came of wicked Cain, highly displeased Almighty God, who thereupon appointed⁵ him to be a preacher of repentance unto them; whom when they contemned and despised, he brought in the flood, and destroyed both them, and all the inhabitants of the world, Noe and his family only excepted. Noe governed the Church before and after the flood, and left the same office and dignity to Shem his eldest son, saying, "Blessed be the God of Shem, and let Canaan be his servant:

¹ Num. iii. 13.² Gen. xlix.³ Gen. iv. 25.⁴ Gen. v.⁵ Gen. vi. and vii.

the Lord persuade Japhet to dwell in the tents of Shem¹." Shem² begat Arphaxad: Arphaxad, Sale: Sale, Heber: Heber, Phaleg: Phaleg, Rehu: Rehu, Serug: Serug, Nachor: Nachor, Thare: Thare, Abraham: and Abraham, Isaac. All these, only Heber and Isaac excepted, he survived; so that, dying, he left the right of his office and dignity to Isaac, Heber having corrupted his ways. This Shem the Jews³ think to have been Melchizedek, that met⁴ Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, that brought out bread and wine, to refresh his wearied troops, and blessed him in the name of the Lord, as being a priest of the high God. Thus then Shem governed the Church in his time, and dying, in part left his honour to Isaac, sojourning as a stranger in Canaan: Isaac to Jacob: Jacob to Judah and his sons; who living in Egypt in bondage with the rest of their brethren, could not freely exercise the kingly and priestly office, nor perform the things pertaining thereunto. So that none of these succeeded Shem in the fulness as well of kingly as priestly power.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE DIVISION OF THE PRE-EMINENCES OF THE FIRST-BORN AMONG THE SONS OF JACOB WHEN THEY CAME OUT OF ÆGYPT, AND THE CHURCH OF GOD BECAME NATIONAL.

BUT when it pleased Almighty God, who chose unto himself the posterity of Israel and sons of Jacob as his peculiar portion and inheritance, above all the nations of the world, to bring them with a mighty hand and outstretched arm out of the land of Egypt and the house of bondage, to the land which he promised to their fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and to make of them a mighty people; then the former kind of government, which was domestical, not so well fitting a people as a household, he settled another; and instead of the first-

¹ Gen. ix. 26, 27.

² Gen. xi. 11.

³ "Nituntur Hebræi Melchisedec regem Salem filium Noe Sem ostendere."—Hieron. Epist. ad Evagrium. [Sive ad Evangelum. Ep. 73. Tom. i. col. 444.]

⁴ Gen. xiv. 18.

born, which formerly in each family and kindred was both a king and priest, he chose the tribe of Judah to sway the sceptre, and to be a lawgiver to the rest of his people; and the tribe of Levi¹ to attend his tabernacle and service: and out of all the families of that tribe, took Aaron² and his sons to serve in the priest's office, appointing the rest to meaner services about the sanctuary, or to be assistants to the priests, and rulers in the government of the people.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE SEPARATION OF AARON AND HIS SONS FROM THE REST OF THE SONS OF LEVI, TO SERVE IN THE PRIEST'S OFFICE, AND OF THE HEAD OR CHIEF OF THAT COMPANY.

THE priests, the sons of Aaron, whom God separated from the rest of their brethren the sons of Levi, were of two sorts. For there was a high priest, and there were others of an inferior condition. Touching the high priest, four things are to be observed³. First, his consecration. Secondly, the

¹ Numb. iii.

² Exod. xxviii.

³ "Quoniam Deus, Exod. xxviii. tabernaculo explicito, de pontifice ita præcepit ut primum de vestibus ejus, deinde de consecratione, tum de conditionibus, ad extremum de muneribus egerit, ob id et nos quoque eundem ordinem in docendo conservaturos, lectore admonito, dicamus. Vestes ergo pontificiæ fuere octo, superhumerales, rationale, tunica hyacinthina, tunica linea stricta, feminalia linea, baltheus, tiara, et lamina aurea. Qualia vero hæc vestimenta fuerint clarius Josephus exposuit, qui stante templo floruit, a quo S. Hieronymus hæc, epistola 128, sumsit 'Vestimentum quod Hebraica lingua dicitur ephod, id est superhumerales, solis convenit pontificibus, ex hyacintho, bysso, cocco, purpura, et auro contextum In utroque humero habet singulos lapides clausos, et astrictos auro onichini aut smaragdi ab interpretibus versi, Josephus sardonichas vocat; et in singulis lapidibus sena patriarcharum nomina sunt, quibus Israeliticus populus dividitur; in dextro humero majores filii Jacob, in lævo minores scripti sunt, ut pontifex ingrediens sancta sanctorum nomina populi pro quo rogaturus est Dominum portet in humeris.'"—Hæc S. Hieronymus ex Josepho.

"Apud eundem porro Josephum quædam alia memorabilia ab eo prætermissa leguntur, ut de lapidibus superhumeralis, et rationalis, et pileo hyacinthino. Nam de lapidibus sic scribit: 'Lapides quos

things that were required in him that was to be consecrated to so sacred a function. Thirdly, his employment; and, fourthly, his attire. The consecration of the high priest was seven days in performing, in this sort: 1. He that was to be consecrated, was brought before the altar. 2. Then he was washed with water, and clothed with those sacred garments which God had prescribed; holy oil was poured on his head, sacrifice was offered on the altar for his sanctification, and his garments were sprinkled with the blood of it. The things that were required in him that was to serve in the high priest's office were these. He might not be defective nor deformed in body;

ferebat super humerum pontifex erant sardoniches. Cum autem Deus sacrificiis adesset is qui in dextro humero portabatur micabat, et tantum splendorem emittebat ut etiam procul positus illucesceret, cum prius ea luce careret. Per duodecim autem lapides rationalis Deus victoriam pugnaturis prænuntiabat: tanto enim splendore fulgebant, cum nondum exercitus moveretur, ut omnibus constaret eorum auxilio adesse Deum.'

"Consecratio vero pontificis per septem dies hoc modo facta est. Qui futurus erat sacerdos, primum ad altare offerebatur, deinde aqua lavabatur, tum vestibus quas diximus induebatur, inde capiti oleum sanctum infundebatur, demum sacrificio præcipuo facto consecrabatur, atque ejus sanguine altare et vestes aspergebantur.

"Conditiones vero illi impositæ aliæ impedimentum attulerunt ne pontifex fieri posset, aliæ factum quibusdam quasi vinculis obligarunt. Primæ sic expressæ sunt Levitici xxi.: 'Pontifex super cujus caput fusum est unctionis oleum, et cujus manus in sacerdotio consecratæ sunt, vestitusque est sanctis vestibus, non erit mancus, debilis, cæcus, claudus, habens maculam albuginem aut ejusmodi alia vitia corporis.' . . . Secundo ita, 'Caput suum non cooperiet, vestimenta sua non scindet, et ad omnem mortuum non ingreditur omnino. Super patre quoque suo et matre sua non contaminabitur, nec egredietur de sanctis, ne polluat sanctuarium Domini, quia oleum sanctæ unctionis Dei super eum est. Virginem ducet uxorem, viduam autem et repudiatam et sordidam et meretricem non accipiet, sed puellam de populo suo, ne communicet stirpem generis sui vulgo gentis suæ.'

"Postremo officia ejus quæ in lege præscripta sunt, hæc fuerunt, ut tabernaculum ingressus quotidie lucernas concinnaret, ingressus vero sanctuarium incensum ad altare thymiamatis adoleret, singulis septimanis panes propositionis conficeret, ac sibi haberet, diebus festis sacrificia populi una cum sacerdotibus faceret, semel autem in anno in die expiationum sacris vestibus indutus ingressus sanctuarium ipsum cum altari thymiamatis ab labibus et peccatis populi expiaret, et simul pro se ac domo sua et toto populo preces funderet."—Sigonius, *De Republica Hebræorum*, Lib. v. cap. 2. [pp. 195—208. Hanov. 1608.]

his wife must be a virgin, not a widow, not one that had been divorced, nor that had been infamous, but of good parentage, and of his own people. He might not uncover his head, rend his garments, nor go in to mourn over any that was dead, no, though it were his father or mother. His employment was to go daily into the sanctuary, to light the lamps, to burn incense, and every week to provide the show-bread or bread of proposition: on the feast-days to offer the people's sacrifices together with the other priests: and once in the year, on the day of expiation, to enter into the holiest of all, to cleanse and hallow it from the sins of the people, and to make prayer for himself and them. The holy vestments, in which he was to perform this service of God, are described to have been a breast-plate, an ephod, a robe, a brodered coat, a mitre, and a girdle. The ephod was of gold, blue silk, purple, scarlet, and fine-twined linen of brodered work; in the shoulders of the ephod were two onyx-stones, and upon them the names of the children of Israel graven, six names upon the one stone, and six other names upon the other stone, according to their generations. These were stones of remembrance of the children of Israel before the Lord. Of these Josephus writeth, that they showed when God was present with his people, when he accepted the sacrifices they offered unto him, and was pleased with them; and likewise when he was displeased with them, and rejected them: in that when God was pleased with his people and accepted their sacrifices, the stone, which was on the right shoulder, shined in such sort that it might be seen afar off, whereas otherwise no such shining brightness appeared in it. The breast-plate of judgment was of brodered work, like the work of the ephod: of gold, blue silk, purple, and scarlet, and fine-twined linen. It was set full of places for stones, even four rows of stones. The stones that were set in these rows were twelve, according to the number of the tribes of Israel, and in them the names of the twelve tribes were graven. In this breast-plate likewise were put Urim and Thummim, which were upon the heart of the high priest when he went in before the Lord. By these twelve stones that were in the breast-plate of the high priest, God did show unto his people the success of their battles when they intended to make war. For if he meant to prosper their enterprise, these stones did so shine, that they were thereby well assured God

would go forth with their armies, and fight their battles for them, otherwise they were discouraged from attempting any thing. The Urim and Thummim likewise some of the Jews¹ think to have been two stones, by which the high priest understood what things were to come, and revealed the same unto the people. For if nothing new and strange were to fall out, they held their colour; but if any great and extraordinary mutation were to follow, the bright shinings of these stones did foreshow it. Others² suppose that they were the Name of God, "Jehovah," in letters of gold, by the shining brightness whereof they understood the answer of God when they sought unto him; but Augustine³ is of opinion that these very words were written in letters of gold in the middle of the breastplate that did hang before the breast of the high priest.

¹ "Hanc rem arbitramur fuisse claram lucidam, speculique instar tersam. Diximus rationale fuisse duplex, tribus lateribus commissum; ex uno autem latere apertum, inter utramque autem partem Urim et Thummim inferebantur, ibidemque servata, sacerdotis hærebant pectori, inde vero proferebantur quoties divinum responsum petendum erat."—Arias Montanus, in Apparatu. [Aaron, sive de Vestimentis. Bibl. Sac. Polyglott. Antv. 1571.]

"Addidere Talmudici lapides Urim et Thummim, sive doctrinam et veritatem, in pectorali pontificis extitisse, quorum conspectu sacerdotes occulta intelligerent et populo traderent, dum plus solito præluerent: nam retento colore naturali nihil immutandum significasse."—Sigonius, De Republica Hebræorum. Lib. v. cap. 9. [p. 260.]

² "R. Salomon vult esse nomen Dei יהוה scriptum in rationali, ex cujus fulgore sacerdos cognoscebat divinum responsum, cum ab aliquo interrogaretur."—Bellarm. De Romano Pontifice. Lib. iv. cap. 3. [Tom. i. p. 396. Ven. 1721.]

³ "Fabulantur quidam lapidem fuisse cujus color sive ad adversa sive ad prospera mutaretur quando sacerdos intrabat in sancta, et hoc esse quod ait, 'Et afferet Aaron judicia filiorum Israel super pectus;' ostendens videlicet in ea demonstratione et veritate, quid de illis judicaverit Dominus. Quanquam possit intelligi demonstrationem et veritatem literis impositam super λόγιον."—August. Quæst. 117 in Exod. [Tom. iii. col. 458.]

CHAPTER V.

OF THE PRIESTS OF THE SECOND RANK OR ORDER.

TOUCHING the priests of the inferior rank, they had the same kind of consecration which the high priest had: in sacrificing they were like unto him, and in the service of the sanctuary, in burning incense, providing the show-bread, and preparing and looking to the lamps and lights: neither was there any other difference between him and them in the performance of these things, but that he was chief, and they assistants unto him. The only thing that was peculiar unto him was the consulting of God by Urim and Thummim¹, and the entering into the Holiest to make an atonement². Their vestments were the same, save that the high priest only had the breast-plate and an ephod of gold³; for the rest did also sometimes wear a linen ephod. The things required in them that were to serve in the priestly office were these: They might not be deformed nor defective in body⁴; they might drink no wine nor strong drink when they were to enter into the sanctuary⁵; they might not defile themselves by the dead, nor come near unto any that was dead, except it were their father or mother, son or daughter, or sister unmarried⁶; they might not shave their heads, nor beards, nor cut their flesh⁷; they might marry no harlot, nor woman divorced⁸. The first that were consecrated priests were Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron⁹; Nadab and Abihu died before their father, and had no children¹⁰: they both

¹ Exod. xxviii. 30.² Lev. xvi. 30.

³ "Extra ordinem etiam sacerdotes induere ephod, id est superhumerales, sed lineum, xxii. primi Regum, 'Irruit in sacerdotes et trucidavit octoginta quinque viros vestitos ephod lineo.' Ubi notavit S. Hieronymus, Ephod illud fuisse lineum, non autem ex hyacintho, bysso, cocco, purpura et auro, ut pontificium. 'Ephod enim,' ut inquit S. Eucherius, 'duorum generum; unum lineum et duplex, quod sacerdotes habebant; alterum diversis coloribus ex auro, purpura, bysso, hyacintho, gemmisque contextum, quo soli pontifices utebantur. Sacerdotale vocatur Ephod *bad*, id est, superhumerales lineum.'"—Sigonius, De Republica Hebr. Lib. v. cap. 3. [p. 225.]

⁴ Lev. xxi. 18.⁵ Lev. x. 9.⁶ Lev. xi. 1.⁷ Lev. xi. 5.⁸ Lev. xi. 7.⁹ Lev. viii.¹⁰ 1 Chron. xxiv. 2.

perished because they offered strange fire upon the altar¹, so that Eleazar and Ithamar only remained, of whom the whole number of priests that were afterwards did come. From Eleazar in David's time were issued sixteen families, and from Ithamar eight². These David sorted into twenty-four classes or courses, and named every classis or course after the name of him who was then chief of each family : and for the ordering of them, and setting one before another, they cast lots. The reason of the sorting of them into these ranks was, for that he would not have all the priests to attend every day, but that they should have some intermission, and times of vacation, one classis performing the service one week, and another, another. Though, saith Josephus³, there be twenty-four classes or courses of priests amongst us, whereof every one hath more than five thousand, yet they wait not all at once, but on certain days appointed and assigned unto them, which being past, others succeed, who are called into the temple at noon, and have the keys thereof delivered unto them, and the sacred vessels by tale. In this sense it is said in the book of Chronicles⁴, that "Jehoiada the priest dismissed not the courses," that is, sent not away the troops and companies of priests that attended the service of the temple, when their time was expired, and according to order they should have departed, and others succeeded them : for that he meant to make use of them in the deposing of wicked Athaliah, and the establishing and settling of the true and lawful king in the royal throne of Judah. In these courses they were wont to cast lots what kind of service every one should do in the week of his attendance, as for example, who should sacrifice, and who should burn incense : whereupon it is said in the Gospel of Luke⁵, that "in the time of Herod, king of Judæa, there was a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abiah⁶; and it came to pass as he executed the priest's office before God, as

¹ Lev. x.² 1 Chron. xxiv. 4.

³ "Sic scriptum est apud Josephum secundo contra Apionem. 'Licet sint viginti quatuor classes sacerdotum quarum singulæ plus quam quinque millia hominum habeant, per certos tamen dies particulares fit observatio: quibus transactis alii succedentes ad sacrificia veniunt, et convocati in templum meridie a præcedentibus claves templi et ad numerum vasa omnia accipiunt, nulla re quæ ad esum aut potum attineat in templum illata.'"—Sigonius, ubi supra. [p. 233.]

⁴ 2 Chron. xxiii. 8.⁵ Luke i. 5.⁶ Luke i. 8, 9.

his course came in order, according to the custom of the priest's office, that his lot was to burn incense when he went into the house and temple of the Lord." Over every of these companies of priests¹ in their courses attending, there were certain priests set, that were called 'Αρχιερεῖς, or *Principes Sacerdotum*, that is chief priests, or rulers of the priests. Of these the Evangelist St Mark² speaketh when he saith, "they brought Jesus to the high priest, and the chief priests sought false witness against him:" that is, the heads of the companies of priests, who came to consult with the high priest about the putting of Jesus to death. For while the policy appointed by Almighty God continued, there was but one that properly was named the high priest.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE LEVITES.

HAVING spoken of Aaron and his sons, whom God chose out of all the families of the tribe of Levi, it remaineth that we speak of the employment of the rest of that tribe, called by the common name of Levites. These³ were sorted by David into four ranks; for some he appointed to be ministers of the priests and temple, who were most specially named Levites, some singers, some porters, and others scribes and judges. Touching the Levites more specially so named, that attended the service of the sanctuary, their office was to carry the Tabernacle and the Ark of the Covenant in the removes

¹ "Jam vero singulis classibus sacerdotum quidam præerant sacerdotes, qui etiam communi nomine cum summo pontifice ἀρχιερεῖς, a Latino vere interprete 'principes sacerdotum' et 'pontifices' versi sunt."—Sigonius, ubi supra. [p. 324.]

² Mark xiv. 53.

³ "David inde Levitarum ordinem alterum instituit, priore illo quodammodo abrogato. Nam arcæ ferendæ onere sublato, Levitas alios sacerdotum et templi ministros qui proprie Levitæ dicti sunt, alios cantores, alios janitores, alios scribas et judices esse constituit."—Sigonius, ubi supra. Lib. v. cap. 4, et cap. 5, 6, 7, passim. [p. 237—250.]

of the people, till God fixed the same in one place; and then they were to take care of it, and the sacred vessels that were in it appointed to be used about the service of God. In later times also they flayed the beasts appointed for the sacrifices, according to that in the second of Chronicles: "The service was prepared, and the priests stood in their places; also the Levites in their orders according to the king's commandment; and they slew the passover, and the priests sprinkled the blood with their hands, and the Levites flayed them¹." Of the singers we read in the first of Chronicles², how they were appointed by David to sing prophecies with harps, with viols, and with cymbals. The porters³ were appointed to see that no uncircumcised, polluted, or unclean person should enter into the house of the Lord, and to guard the same that all things therein might be in safety, as the sacred vessels, the treasure of the house, and the treasure of the dedicated things. To these were added as assistants the Nethinims or Gibeonites⁴, who served as hewers of wood and drawers of water⁵. The scribes were such as read, and interpreted the Law of God in the temple at Jerusalem, and in the synagogues that were in other parts of the land, and are also called Doctors of the Law, that is, interpreters of the Law of God.

CHAPTER VII.

OF THE SECTS, AND FACTIONS IN RELIGION, FOUND AMONGST
THE JEWS IN LATER TIMES.

AND here because we have made mention of such Levites as were scribes, that is, doctors and interpreters of the Law of God, it is not out of place to speak of the doctrine of the Jews in later times, and the several sects into which their teachers and guides were divided. Epiphanius⁶ sheweth that

¹ 2 Chron. xxxv. 10, 11.

² 1 Chron. xxv. 1.

³ 1 Chron. xxvi.

⁴ 1 Chron. ix. 2. Ezra ii. 70.

⁵ Josh. ix. 23.

⁶ "Αἵρεσεῖς πάλιν μετὰ ταύτας τὰς προειρημένας τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν καὶ ἄνω ποῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων προδηλωθείσας, γεγόνασιν ἑπτὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις, πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνσάρκου παρουσίας, ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ τε καὶ

there were seven principal sects amongst them; the first whereof was that of the scribes¹, who were interpreters of the Law, but such as delivered many traditions as from their elders, that were not contained in the Law, and sought to bring in a more exact kind of worship of God than Moses and the prophets taught, consisting in many voluntary observations and customs devised by men.

The second, Sadducees², which were of the race of the Samaritans. These had their name from one Sadoc a priest; they denied the resurrection, and believed not that there is any angel or spirit, and consequently overthrew all religion.

The third sort were Pharisees³. These were the strictest of all other, and most esteemed: they believed the resurrection of the dead, that there are angels and spirits, as the scribes also did, and that all shall come into judgment, to re-

Ἱεροσολύμοις.”—Epiphan. Contra Hæres. Lib. i. Hæres. 14. [Tom. i. p. 31. Par. 1622.]

¹ “Μετὰ τούτους τοὺς Σαδουκαίους Γραμματεῖς γεγόνασιν ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ χρόνου ἢ καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἡλικίαν κατάγοντες, οἵτινες ἦσαν δευτερωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ὡς γραμματικὴν τινα ἐπιστήμην ὑφηγούμενοι, τὰ ἄλλα πράττοντες τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Περιττὴν δέ τινα δῆθεν σοφιστικὴν ὑφήγησιν εἰσηγούμενοι οὐ κατὰ νόμον μόνον βιοῦντες ἀλλὰ περισσότερον, ξεστῶν βαπτισμοὺς φυλάσσοντες, καὶ ποτηρίων, καὶ πινάκων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σκευῶν τὰς ὑπηρεσίας, ὡς δῆθεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκραιφνὲς καὶ ὅσιον διακείμενοι.”—Epiphan. Contra Hæres. Lib. i. Hæres. 15. [Tom. i. p. 32. Par. 1622.]

² “Πρῶτοι Σαδουκαῖοι, ἀπόσπασμα ὄντες ἀπὸ Δοσιθέου τοῦ προλελεγμένου, ἐπονομάζουσι καὶ οὗτοι ἑαυτοὺς Σαδδουκαιοὺς, δῆθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὀρμουμένης. Σεδὲκ γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη. Ἦν δὲ καὶ Σαδούκ τις τοῦνομα κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν τῶν ἱερέων.”—Id. Hæres. 14. [p. 31.]

³ “Ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν αἵρέσεσι κατ’ ἀκολουθίαν συνῆπται ἡ τῶν Φαρισαίων αἵρεσις, ἄλλη τις, οἵτινες τὰ αὐτὰ τουτοῖς ἐφρόνουν, γραμματεῦσι δέ φημι, τοῖς ἐρμηνευομένοις νομοδιδασκάλοις. συνῆσαν γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱ νομικοί. Ἀλλὰ δὲ καὶ παρὰ τούτους πάλιν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐφρόνουν, πολιτείας μείζους ἔχοντες. Τινὲς μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὅτε ἤσκουν ὥριζον δεκαντίαν ἢ ὀκταετίαν, ἢ τετραετίαν· ὁμοίως παρθενίας, ἢ ἐγκρατείας συνεχῶς ἐχόμενοι πυκνότερον ἀγῶνα τοῦτον ἐνίσταντο. . . . ἐνήστευον δὲ δις τοῦ Σαββάτου, δευτέραν καὶ πέμπτην· ἀποδεκάτουν δὲ τὴν δεκάτωσιν· . . . τῷ δὲ προειρημένῳ σχήματι τῶν γραμματέων προήρχοντο, διάτοι τῆς ἀμπεχόνης καὶ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων σχημάτων, καὶ γυναικικῶν ἱματίων ἐν πλατείαις ταῖς κρηπίσι καὶ γλώτταις τῶν ὑποδημάτων προϊόντες. . . . Ὁμολόγουν δὲ οὗτοι ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν ἐπίστευόν τε ἀγγέλους εἶναι, καὶ πνεῦμα. . . . Ἐσχάτη δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀπόρια καὶ ἡλιθιότης οὐχ ἡ τυχούσα τοῖς καὶ ἀνάστασιν ὁμολογοῦσι καὶ κρίσιν δικαίαν ὀριζομένοις, εἰμαρμένην λέγειν, πῶς γὰρ δύναται κρίσις εἶναι καὶ εἰμαρμένη.”—Id. Hæres. 16. [pp. 33, 5.]

ceive according to the things they do in this body, whether they be good or evil: they much honoured virginity and single life: they paid tithes of the smallest things they possessed: they washed cups, platters, and all kind of vessels they used: they fasted twice every week: they brought in the doctrine of fatal necessity: and differed in their habit from other men.

The fourth sort were the Hemerobaptists¹, who did think that no man could be saved if he were not washed every day, that so he might be cleansed from the impurity of sin; but, as Epiphanius rightly noteth in refutation of the error of these men, it is not the whole flood Jordan wherein Christ was baptized, nor the sea, nor any fountain abounding with water, that can wash away the impurity of sin by any natural force thereof or voluntary use; but repentance, and the use of such sacred ceremonies and sacramental elements, as God appointeth to signify, express, and communicate unto us the virtue of Christ Jesus, and the sanctifying grace of the Spirit of God.

Next unto the Hemerobaptists were the Essenes². These withdrew themselves from the society of other men. They despised marriage, and lived without the company of women: having no children of their own, they adopted such as voluntarily came unto them. *Quos vita fessos, saith Pliny³, ad mores eorum fortunæ fluctus agitat: ita per sæculorum millia (incredibile dictu) gens æterna est, in qua nemo nascitur; tam fœcunda illis aliorum vitæ pœnitentia est.* That is, “Such as, wearied with the turmoils of this life,

¹ “Ταύταις δὲ συνέπεται τις αἵρεσις Ἡμεροβαπτιστῶν ἔφασκεν αὕτη ἄλλως πως μὴ εἶναι ζῆν ἀνθρώπων, εἰ μὴ τι ἄρα καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν βαπτίζοιτό τις ἐν ὕδατι, ἀπολουόμενός τε καὶ ἀγνιζόμενος ἀπὸ πάσης αἰτίας... Μάταιος αὐτῶν ἡ ὑπόνοια καὶ τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα φροῦδον καὶ ἔωλον. Οὔτε γὰρ ὠκεανὸς οὔτε πάντα τὰ ῥέεθρα καὶ πελάγη, πόταμοί τε ἀένναοι καὶ πηγαὶ πᾶσα τε ἡ ὀμβροτόκος φύσις συνελθοῦσα δύναται ἁμαρτήματα ἀφανίσαι, ἐπειδήπερ οὐ κατὰ λόγον οὐδὲ ἐκ προστάγματος Θεοῦ γίνεται, μετάνοια γὰρ καθαρίζει καὶ τὸ ἐν βάπτισμα διὰ τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων ὀνομασίας.”—Id. Hæres. 17. [p. 37.]

² “Μετὰ ταύτην, πάλιν αὕτη τις αἵρεσις ταύταις παραπεπλεγμένη, ἡ τῶν Ὀσσηνῶν καλουμένη. . . . Φασὶ δέ τινα Ἰεξέον, γέγονε δὲ οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πεπλανημένος τὸν τρόπον, ἀπατηλὸς δὲ γνώμην, ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων ὀρμώμενος καὶ τὰ Ἰουδαίων φρονῶν, κατὰ νόμον δὲ μὴ πολιτευόμενος, ἕτερα δὲ ἀνθ’ ἐτέρων παρεισφέρων. Ἀπεχθάνεται δὲ τῇ παρθενίᾳ, μισεῖ δὲ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν, ἀναγκάζει δὲ γάμον.”—Id. Hæres. 19. [p. 40.]

³ Plinius, Nat. Hist. Lib. v. cap. 17.

were, by the experience of fortune's uncertainties, forced to like their retired manner of living; so that for many ages (which is a thing not credible) there hath been a never-failing nation in which no man is born. So many doth other men's dislike of their own manner of living send unto them." These were something like the monks and religious men that are and have been among Christians.

The sixth sort were the Nazaræi¹, who in all other things were Jews, but held it unlawful to kill any living thing, or to eat the flesh of anything wherein the spirit of life had been; they condemned the bloody sacrifices prescribed in Moses' law, and therefore could not be induced to think that Moses was author of those books that go under his name; yet did they honour Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and other holy men mentioned in them.

The seventh and last sort were the Herodians², who were of the Jews' religion in all other things, but thought Herod to be the Christ; because the sceptre departed from Judah, and the lawgiver from between his feet, when Herod who was a stranger, obtained the title and power of a king, and ruled over the people of God.

These were the sects and heresies that prevailed in the Church of the Jews before the coming of Christ, amongst whom the Pharisees and Sadducees were chief; so that the whole state seemed to be divided into these two factions³, the

¹ "Ἐξῆς δὲ ἐπιβαλοῦμαι διηγείσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν αἵρεσιν τὴν καλουμένην τῶν Ναζαράϊων, οἵτινες Ἰουδαῖοι εἰσι τὸ γένος. . . . Πατέρας μὲν ἐδέχετο τοὺς ἐν τῇ Πεντατεύχῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως, τοὺς ἐν ἀριστείᾳ θεοσεβείας διαφανεῖς ὑπαρξάντας, αὐτὴν δὲ οὐ παρεδέχετο τὴν Πεντατεύχον, ἀλλὰ ὡμολόγει μὲν τὸν Μωϋσέα καὶ ὅτι ἐδέξατο νομοθεσίαν ἐπίστευεν οὐ ταύτην δὲ φησὶν ἀλλ' ἑτέραν, ὅθεν τὰ μὲν πάντα φυλάττουσι τῶν Ἰουδαίων Ἰουδαῖοι ὄντες, θυσίαν δὲ οὐκ ἔθνον οὔτε ἐμψύχων μετεῖχον, ἀλλὰ ἀθέμιτον ἦν παρ' αὐτοῖς τὸ κρεῶν μεταλαμβάνειν ἢ θυσιάζειν αὐτούς. Ἐφασκον γὰρ πεπλάσθαι ταῦτα τὰ βιβλία καὶ μηδὲν τούτων ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων γεγενῆσθαι."—Id. Hæres. 18. [p. 38.]

² "Μετὰ ταύτην δὲ καὶ μετὰ ταύτας πάλιν ἐβδόμη αἵρεσις ἦν ἡ τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν καλουμένη. Οὐδὲν δὲ εἶχόν τι παρηλλαγμένον οὗτοι, ἀλλ' ὅλοι εἰσιν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἀργοί τε καὶ ὑποκριταί. Ἑρώδην δὲ οὗτοι ἡγούντο Χριστὸν Κύριον, ἐκ τοῦ ῥητοῦ συναρπασθέντες τοῦ εἰρημένου, οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα, οὐδὲ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα."—Id. Hæres. 23. [p. 45.]

³ "Ex his omnibus præcipue floruerunt ante Christi adventum Pha-

nobles and great ones inclining for the most part to the Sadducees, and the common people to the Pharisees; whereupon we read in the Acts of the Apostles, that Paul standing before Ananias the high priest and the rest of the chief priests and rulers of the people to be judged, knowing that the one part of them were Sadducees, and the other part Pharisees, cried aloud, "I am a Pharisee, and the son of a Pharisee; I am accused of the hope and resurrection of the dead¹:" and that upon the hearing of these words, there was a dissension between the Pharisees and Sadducees, so that the whole multitude was divided; that there was a great cry; and that the scribes of the Pharisees' part arose up and strove, saying, "We find no evil in the man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken unto him, let us not fight against God²."

CHAPTER VIII.

OF PROPHETS AND NAZARITES.

BESIDES the priests and Levites, whom God chose to attend his service and sanctuary, rent and divided in latter times into the manifold factions and heresies above mentioned, there were other who meddled not with the ministry of holy things, and yet were specially dedicated and sanctified unto God. These were either such as dedicated their bodies and persons unto God, as the Nazarites; or such as God raised up extraordinarily to foreshow future things, and to reform abuses and errors, as were the prophets.

The vow of the Nazarites is described in the book of Numbers, where the Lord God spake unto Moses, saying: "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When a man or woman doth separate themselves to vow a vow of a Nazarite, to separate himself unto the Lord, he shall abstain from wine and strong drink; no razor shall come upon

risæi et Sadducæi. Itaque Hierosolymis, ut inquit Josephus, populares Pharisæis, optimates Sadducæis se adjunxerunt."—Sigonius, *De Republica Hebræorum*. Lib. v. cap. 11. [p. 280.]

¹ Acts xxiii. 6.

² Acts xxiii. 9.

his head, but he shall let the locks of the hair of his head to grow, during the time that he separateth himself unto the Lord: he shall come at no dead body, he shall not make himself unclean at the death of his father or mother, brother or sister: for the consecration of the Lord is upon his head¹."

The Nazarites were of two sorts: for some did separate themselves unto the Lord but for a time, and others perpetually. Nazarites of the former sort they were, of whom James and the elders do speak in the Acts, saying unto Paul: "We have four men which have made a vow: them take, and purify thyself with them, and contribute with them, that they may shave their heads; and all shall know that those things whereof they have been informed concerning thee are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest and keepest the law²." Of the latter sort the Scripture mentioneth only two: Sampson and Samuel. Concerning Sampson we read that the angel of God appeared unto the wife of Manoah, his mother, and said unto her: "Behold now thou art barren, and bearest not, but thou shalt conceive, and bear a son: and now therefore beware that thou drink no wine nor strong drink, neither eat any unclean thing. For lo, thou shalt conceive, and bear a son, and no razor shall come on his head; for the child shall be a Nazarite unto God from his birth, and he shall begin to save Israel out of the hands of the Philistines³." And of Samuel, his mother said before he was born: "I will give him to the Lord all the days of his life, and no razor shall come upon his head⁴." To these Hierome⁵ addeth out of Hegesippus, James the just, the brother of our Lord.

Prophets properly are such as foreknow and foretell things that are to come: but because, as Gregory⁶ fitly noteth,

¹ Numb. vi. 2.

² Acts xxi. 23.

³ Judges xiii. 7.

⁴ 1 Sam. i. 11.

⁵ "Hegesippus vicinus apostolicorum temporum, in quinto commentariorum libro de Jacobo narrans, ait: 'Suscepit ecclesiam Jerosolymorum post apostolos frater Domini Jacobus, cognomento Justus. Multi siquidem Jacobi vocabantur. Hic de utero matris sanctus fuit, vinum et siceram non bibit, carnem nullam comedit, nunquam attonsus fuit, nec unctus fuit unguento, nec usus balneo.'"—Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccles. de Jacobo. [Sive de Viris Illustribus, Tom. II. col. 815.]

⁶ "Animadvertendum est quod recte prophetia dicitur, non quia prædicit ventura, sed quia prodit occulta. Ventura etenim res occultatur in futuro tempore, præsens autem cogitatio absconditur in latenti

it is as hard to know the things that are past, whereof there is no report, and the things that are done afar off, or in secret, or that are but contrived, and resolved on in the purposes of the heart, as to foresee what shall come to pass hereafter; the knowledge of all these things pertaineth to prophetic grace and illumination; and it was no less a prophetic spirit that directed Moses in writing the story of the creation, fall, and propagation of mankind, nor no less a prophetic illumination that made Elizeus know what was done in the king Aram's privy chamber; than it was in Esay and the rest, that enabled them to foretell and foreshow the things that were to come. And therefore the divines make divers sorts of prophets: some to whom principally things past were revealed, or hidden things then being; and some to whom things that were after to come to pass were more specially manifested or made known¹; some that were prophets both in grace and mission, some in grace only. In grace and mission, as they that were specially sent to foreshow the people of God what was to come to pass, to tell them of their transgressions, and the judgments that were to follow: in grace only, as were all such as were not specially employed to this purpose, and yet had the knowledge of secret things, as Daniel, and some other.

corde. Sciendum quoque est, quia prophetiæ tempora invicem sibi concinnunt ad probationem, ut aliquando ex futuris præterita, aliquando vero ex præteritis probentur futura. Dixerat enim Moyses, 'In principio creavit Deus cælum et terram.' Sed quis crederet quia verum de præterito diceret, si de futuro etiam aliquid non dixisset?"—Greg. Mag. in Ezechiel. Hom. i. [Tom. i. col. 1175. Par. 1705.]

¹ "Propheta tribus modis dicitur; officio, gratia, missione. Vulgo autem usitato vocabulo magis prophetæ vocantur, qui vel officio vel aperta missione prophetæ sunt."—Hugo de Sancto-Victore, De Sacramentis Fidei. Lib. i. Part. 1. Prolog. [cap. 7. Tom. iii. p. 487. Rothom. 1648.]

CHAPTER IX.

OF ASSEMBLIES UPON EXTRAORDINARY OCCASIONS.

THUS having spoken sufficiently of the persons that God sanctified to serve him in the temple, and to teach, direct, and instruct his people; as also of such as voluntarily dedicated themselves unto him, or were extraordinarily raised up by him; let us see what the government of the Church and people of God was under them during the time of the law, until the coming of Christ.

The Scriptures show us, that God appointed for the government of his people extraordinary assemblies, and set judgments. Whereunto the Prophet David seemeth to allude when he saith, "The wicked shall not rise up in judgment, nor sinners in the assembly of the righteous¹." In assemblies were handled things concerning the state of the whole commonwealth. In the set courts, things concerning particular parts of it. Assemblies were of two sorts: either of the whole people, or of the elders and rulers only. Assemblies of the whole people were gathered together to hear the commandments of God, to make public prayers unto him, or to perform and do some extraordinary thing; as to appoint a king, a judge, or a prince, to proclaim or wage war, or the like.

These assemblies were either of the whole people of Israel, or only of the whole people of one tribe or city. For the calling of these assemblies, God commanded two trumpets² of silver to be made and to be in the custody of Moses and his successors: with this direction, that when they blowed with them both, all the congregation should assemble unto them; but when they blowed but with one, the princes or heads over the thousands of Israel only should come.

The set courts and tribunals were of two sorts, the one in the gates of every city, called *Κρίσις*, "judgment;" the other at Jerusalem, called *συνέδριον*, "a council:" whereunto Christ seemeth to have alluded, when he said, "Whosoever is angry with his brother unadvisedly, shall be guilty of judgment: but whosoever saith, Racha, shall be guilty of a council: and he that saith, Thou fool, shall be worthy to be punished with

¹ Psalm i. 5.² Numb. x. 2.

Gehenna of fire, or the fiery Gehenna¹.” Thereby showing us, that one of these offences and faults is more grievous and worthy of greater punishment than the other: for the council or Sanhedrim did handle weightier causes, and might inflict more grievous punishments than the set courts of justice in the gates of every city. So that this is it he meant to say: He that is angry with his brother unadvisedly shall be guilty of judgment, that is, of some lighter punishment; and he that saith “Racha,” shall be subject to the council, that is, punished more grievously; but he that saith “Thou fool,” shall be punished with all extremity, answering in proportion to the cruel and merciless burning of men in the valley of Hinnom², or the fiery Gehenna.

St Augustine, in his first book *De Sermone Domini in Monte*³, doth somewhat otherwise, but very excellently, express the meaning of Christ’s words, in this sort: “There are,” saith he, “degrees of sin in this kind mentioned by Christ:” *itaque in primo unum est, id est, ira sola: in secundo, duo, et ira, et vox quæ iram significat: in tertio, tria, et ira, et vox quæ iram significat, et in voce ipsa certæ vituperationis expressio. Vide nunc etiam tres reatus, judicii, concilii, et Gehennæ ignis. Nam in judicio adhuc defensionis datur locus: ad concilium pertinet sententiæ prolatio, quando non jam cum reo agitur, utrum damnandus sit, sed inter se qui judicant, conferunt, quo supplicio damnari oporteat, quem constat esse damnandum. Gehenna vero ignis nec damnationem habet dubiam, sicut judicium, nec damnati pœnam sicut concilium: in Gehenna quippe ignis certa est et damnatio, et pœna damnati.* That is, “In the first degree there is but one thing, that is, anger only; in the second two, anger and a voice expressing anger; in the third, three, anger, the voice that giveth signification of it, and in the voice itself an expressing of some certain reproach. See now also three guilts, of judgment, of council, and the Gehenna of fire: for in judgment there is yet place left for defence; to council pertaineth the pronouncing of the sentence, when there is no more

¹ Matt. v. 22.

² 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6.

³ August. De Sermone Domini in Monte. Lib. i. cap. 19. [Aliter, cap. 9. Tom. III. Part. 2. col. 175.] “Apparet Augustinum judicialis rationis Hebraicæ notionem non habuisse.”—Sigonius, De Rep. Hebr. Lib. vi. cap. 7. [p. 321.]

to be done with the party guilty, nor no further doubt whether he be to be condemned or not, but they that judge take counsel and confer amongst themselves to what punishment they shall condemn him, of whose condemnation they are already resolved; but in the Gehenna of fire there is neither doubtfulness of condemnation, as in judgment, nor of the punishment of the condemned, as in council; for there both the condemnation is certain, and the punishment also."

The Papists allege the words of Christ for proof of venial sins, because only the last degree of unadvised and causeless anger is pronounced worthy to be punished with Gehenna of fire, or hell-fire. Whence they think it may be concluded, that other degrees of causeless anger, though sinful, yet do not subject men to any punishment in hell, and consequently are by nature venial. But if we understand that Christ alluded to the different courts of justice amongst the Jews, their proceedings in the same, and the diversity of punishments which they inflicted more or less grievous, as Sigonius, in his book *De Repub. Hebræorum*¹, and other excellently learned do; then by Gehenna of fire is not simply meant hell-fire, which is the general punishment of damned sinners, but the greatest extremity of punishment in hell, expressed by comparison with the cruel torments which they endured that were consumed in fire in Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom, far more intolerable than were the punishments inflicted by the judgment or council, to which the lighter and lesser punishments in hell, due to lesser and lighter sins, may be resembled. And though we understand the words as Augustine doth, yet is not their error confirmed by this place: for, as he fitly noteth, whereas to kill is more grievous than to wrong by contumelious and railing speeches, amongst the Pharisees only killing was thought to make a man guilty of judgment; but here anger, the least of all the sins mentioned by Christ, is by him pronounced guilty of judgment; and whereas amongst them the question of murder was brought before the judgment-seat of men, here all things are left to the judgment of God, where the end of the condemned and guilty is hell-fire. And for farther clearing of

¹ "Ut in judicio crimina leviora, in concilio graviora disquirebantur, sic in illo poenæ leviores, in hoc acerbiores infligebantur; nam gehennam locum fuisse tradunt quo cadavera damnatorum cremanda projiciebantur."—Sigonius, ubi supra. [p. 321.]

this point he addeth, that if any man shall say that murder, as more grievous, is to be punished more grievously, according to the rule of justice, than with hell-fire, if railing speeches be punishable with hell-fire, he will force us to acknowledge divers hells, or kinds and degrees of punishments in hell. So far was Augustine from imagining any such difference of sins, whereof some should be worthy to be punished in hell, and some not, to be proved out of this place, as our adversaries would enforce and urge.

CHAPTER X.

OF THE SET COURTS AMONGST THE JEWS; THEIR AUTHORITY AND CONTINUANCE.

TOUCHING the tribunals and judgments that were in every city, God said unto Moses: "Thou shalt appoint thee judges and magistrates in all thy cities¹;" and again: "They shall go up to the judges that sit in the gates of the city." But the Sanhedrim², or great council of state, consisted of the king, the twelve princes of the people, the seventy elders, the high priest, the chief priests, and the scribes. And this council was first in Siloh, afterwards at Jerusalem; first in the tribe of Ephraim, and after in the tribe of Judah: and after the rent of the ten tribes, none but the elders of Judah and Benjamin and the priests and Levites entered into this council.

This council either the king or high priest called, according as the matter to be heard touched religion or the commonwealth: but after the return from Babylon, the high priest was always chief, and governed with the elders and chief

¹ Deut. xvi. 18.

² "Consistorium Gazith, quod Græci συνέδριον et Cathedram, Latini Concilium, Talmudistæ Sanhedrim nominarunt, fuit tribunal omnium et numero et dignitate judicum amplissimum in ea urbe quam Deus elegit, ac caput esse sanctitatis atque imperii statuit, id est primum in Silo, deinde Hierosolymis, sive primum in tribu Ephraim, deinde Juda constitutum Inivere hoc concilium rex cum principibus populi, ac Lxx. senioribus populi, et pontifex cum principibus sacerdotum et scribis."—Sigonius, Lib. vi. cap. 7. [pp. 310, 314.]

priests: for there were no more kings of Judah after that time, but the kings of Persia, Egypt, and Syria, had the command over Judæa, and made the Jews pay tribute unto them. Of this council Almighty God did speak, when he said, "If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment between blood and blood, between plea and plea, between plague and plague, in matters of controversy within thy gates, then shalt thou arise and go up to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose; and thou shalt come unto the priests of the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and ask, and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment: and thou shalt do according unto that thing which they of that place which the Lord hath chosen, show thee: and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee, according to the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, shalt thou do: thou shalt not decline from the thing which they shall show thee, neither to the right hand, nor to the left: and that man that will do presumptuously, not hearkening to the priest that standeth before the Lord thy God to minister there, or unto the judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt take away evil from Israel¹."

This was the highest court amongst the Jews, and from this there was no appeal: and this court some think to have enjoyed so great and ample privileges, as that it could not err: and thereupon infer, that popes in their consistories cannot err, to whom Christ hath made as large promises of assistance and direction as ever he did to the high priests and rulers in the time of Moses' law.

That the priests and rulers in the time of the law could not err, they endeavour to prove, because he was to answer it with his blood whosoever disobeyed the sentence and decree of those judges; and God required every man, without declining to the right hand or the left, to do that they commanded.

If it be objected that the words of Almighty God, requiring all men so strictly to obey the sentence and decree of those rulers, are not to be understood concerning matters of faith, but causes civil and criminal; and that therefore this place maketh not any proof of the infallibility of their judg-

¹ Deut. xvii. 8—12.

ment in matters of faith; it will be answered, that there is no reason to doubt of their judgment in matters of faith, of whose right judgment in matters civil and criminal we are assured.

Surely, it is true, that if those judges in the time of the law could not err in matters civil and criminal, they were undoubtedly much more freed from danger of erring in matters of faith; but it is one of the strangest paradoxes, as I think, that ever yet was heard of, that the priests and judges in the time of the law were privileged from danger of erring in matters of fact, and that they were so assisted in their proceedings, as that they could not be misled by any passions or sinister affections, to pervert judgment and do wrong. For besides that it is refuted by sundry instances of sinister and wicked judgments passed by those judges against the servants and prophets of Almighty God, it maketh the ministry and government under the Law incomparably more glorious and excellent than the ministry of the Gospel. For it is by all confessed, that the popes and councils may err in things of this nature. But that the priests in the time of the law did sometimes err in judgment, condemning them whom God would not have had condemned, appeareth evidently by that we read in the book of the prophecies of Jeremy, where “when Jeremy had made an end of speaking all that the Lord commanded him to speak, then the priest and the prophets, and all the people took him, and said, Thou shalt die the death¹.” And “when the princes of Judah heard of these things, they came up from the king’s house into the house of the Lord, and sat down in the entry of the new gate of the Lord’s house. Then spake the priests and the prophets unto the princes and to all the people, saying, This man is worthy to die²;” but the princes said, “This man is not worthy to die: for he hath spoken unto us in the name of the Lord our God³.” Here we see the priests erred, and were resisted by the princes of the land: but elsewhere we read, that “the princes also were angry with Jeremy, and smote him, and laid him in prison in the house of Jonathan the scribe⁴,” and said unto the king, “We beseech thee, let this man be put to death, for he weakeneth the hands of the men of war that are in the city,

¹ Jer. xxvi. 8.

³ Jer. xxvi. 16.

² Jer. xxvi. 10.

⁴ Jer. xxxvii. 15.

and the hands of all the people¹." So that both priests and princes might, and did sometimes, err in judgment. But some man perhaps will say, that howsoever they might err in matters of fact, yet they could not err in matter of substance pertaining to the worship and service of God. This also is clearly demonstrated to be false, and their errors in things pertaining to the worship and service of God proved by sundry examples.

In the second book of Kings we read, that "Ahaz king of Judah walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, made his sons go through the fire, after the abominations of the heathen, and offered burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree²." This wicked Ahaz "sent from Dasmascus to Urias the priest the pattern of the altar he saw at Damascus, and the fashion of it, and all the workmanship thereof; and Urias the priest made an altar in all points like to that which king Ahaz sent from Damascus³." So did Urias the priest before king Ahaz came from Damascus; and the king commanded Urias to offer sacrifice on the altar⁴; and Urias did whatsoever the king commanded him⁵. Yea, we read of many priests, especially about the time of the Maccabees, that forsook the law of God, and followed the abominations of the heathen idolaters; and many judges and kings likewise; so that David, Hezekiah, and Josias only excepted, there was none of the kings that did not decline more or less to idolatry.

The meaning therefore of Almighty God, according to the judgment of the best divines⁶, was not that priests and judges in the time of the law should be obeyed in all things without exception, but when they commanded and judged according to the divine law and verity: and in the same sort must we understand the words of Christ, when he saith: "The scribes and Pharisees sit on the chair of Moses⁷;" and commandeth the people to observe and do whatsoever they prescribe to be

¹ Jer. xxxviii. 4.

² 2 Kings xvi. 3.

³ 2 Kings xvi. 10, 11.

⁴ 2 Kings xvi. 15.

⁵ 2 Kings xvi. 16.

⁶ "Juxta legem." Nota non dicitur tibi ut obedias nisi juxta legem docuerint. Unde, 'Supra cathedram Moysi sederunt scribæ et Pharisei.'—Nicol. de Lyra, in Deut. 17. [Biblia Sacra Vulgata, cum Glossa ordinaria, postillis Nicol. de Lyra, &c. Tom. i. col. 1568. Antv. 1634.]

⁷ Matt. xxiii. 2.

observed and done. For otherwise Christ would be contrary to himself, who elsewhere willeth men to “beware of the leaven of the Pharisees¹,” (which St Matthew interpreteth to be their doctrine²) and teacheth men by his own example to condemn their traditions³. Yea, it is most certain, that the Pharisees erred dangerously and damnably in many things, notwithstanding their sitting on Moses’ chair: and therefore Christ doth oftentimes sharply reprove them for mis-interpreting the law of God.

Some man perhaps will say, they taught less than is implied in the law, in that they condemned murder, adultery, and the like crimes, but not lust, hatred, and such other sinister affections of the heart; and that therefore Christ did not reprove them as teaching anything contrary to the law, but as teaching less than is contained in it, and coming short of it. This evasion will not serve; for it appeareth evidently that they did not only come short of that the law requireth, but were also contrary unto it, and that Christ taxeth them for the same. *Quia non intelligebant* (saith St Augustine⁴) *homicidium nisi per interemptionem corporis humani per quam vita privaretur, aperuit Dominus omnem iniquum motum ad nocendum fratri in homicidii genere deputari: unde et Johannes dicit, Qui odit fratrem suum, homicida est: et quoniam putabant tantummodo corporalem cum foemina illicitam commixtionem vocari mœchiam, demonstravit Magister etiam talem concupiscentiam nihil esse aliud: that is, “They understood no other kind of murder but that which is the sundering of soul and body, and the taking away of life; therefore our Lord showed that every unrighteous motion to hurt our brother is to be accounted murder: whence also St John saith, ‘He that hateth his brother is a man-slayer:’ and because they thought the unlawful conjunction of man and woman only to be adultery, our Master showed that even the desire is no less.” Now I think, that to say, that is not murder nor adultery which Christ pronounceth to be murder and adultery, is not only to teach less than is in the law, but to teach contrary to it.*

But to make this point more clear and evident, and that

¹ Matt. xvi. 6.

² Matt. xvi. 12.

³ Matt. xv. 1—6.

⁴ August. contr. Faust. Manich. Lib. xix. [cap. 23. Tom. viii. col. 325.]

there may be no doubt but that their doctrine was contrary to the law, the Scripture reporteth, nay, our Saviour Christ telleth us in the Scripture (whose report we may not doubt of) that they taught a man “to love his friend, and hate his enemy¹:” whereas by the law of God we are bound “to love our enemies, to bless them that curse us, to do good to them that hate us, and to pray for them that hurt us and persecute us.” It is true indeed, that St Augustine², not observing this gloss of hating our enemies, to be the lewd tradition of the Pharisees, but thinking it to be written in the law, doth in one place say, that that which is said in the law, “Thou shalt hate thine enemy,” is not to be taken as the voice of him that commandeth and prescribeth what the just should do, but permitteth what the infirmity of the weak requireth; and in another place writing against the Manichees saith³, that that which is in the old Scripture, “Hate thine enemy,” and that which is in the Gospel, “Love your enemies,” do agree together very well: for every unrighteous man *in quantum iniquus est, odio habendus est, et in quantum homo, diligendus*, “in that he is unrighteous, is to be hated, and in that he is a man, is to be loved.” This saying, he saith the Pharisees did not rightly understand, and that therefore Christ laboured to teach and instruct them better, and to let them know, that they were so to hate their enemies, that they should also love them.

This which St Augustine delivereth is most catholic and true: for we are to hate the vices, and love the persons of our enemies; but neither is there any mandate in the Scriptures that we should hate our enemies, neither had that precept

¹ Matt. v. 43.

² “Nec quod in lege dictum est, ‘Oderis inimicum tuum,’ vox jubentis justo accipienda est, sed permittentis infirmo.”—Id. De Sermone Domini in Monte. Lib. i. cap. 41. [Aliter, cap. 21. Tom. iii. Part. 2. col. 196.]

³ “Ea quippe regula et hoc solvitur, doceturque non esse contrarium quod in antiqua Scriptura dictum est, ‘Oderis inimicum tuum,’ et in Evangelio, ‘Diligite inimicos vestros,’ quod unusquisque iniquus homo, in quantum iniquus est odio habendus est, in quantum autem homo est diligendus est. . . . Sic apparebit Dominum male intelligentibus id quod dictum est, ‘Oderis inimicum tuum,’ inferre voluisse quod omnino non norant, ut diligenter inimicos suos.”—Id. contr. Faust. Manich. Lib. xix. cap. 24. [Tom. viii. col. 326.]

of the Pharisees that sense wherein St Augustine conceiveth a man may lawfully hate his enemies : but as himself confesseth, they thought they were so to hate their enemies, that they were not bound to love them ; against which erroneous conceit Christ opposeth himself, saying, “ But I say unto you, Love your enemies.” Neither doth he oppose an evangelical counsel of greater perfection than the law requireth, to that imperfect thing the law prescribeth, as some men have ignorantly fancied ; but the true meaning of the law, to the false construction of the same made by the Pharisees ; as likewise he doth in all other his oppositions to that which had been said to them of old time.

But let us let this pass, and come to the other errors of the Pharisees taxed by our Saviour Christ in such sort as no man can excuse them : “ Why do ye transgress,” saith he, “ the commandment of God by your traditions ? for God hath commanded, saying, Honour thy father and thy mother ; and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death : but ye say, Whosoever shall say to father or mother, By the gift that is offered by me thou mayest have profit, though he honour not his father or mother, shall be free. Thus have you made the commandment of God of none effect by your own tradition¹.” Again, they taught that it is “ nothing if a man swear by the altar, but that he that sweareth by the gift or offering that is on the altar is a debtor²,” that is, bound to do that he sweareth. Many other like fond and wicked glosses of the Pharisees we read of, whereby they made the commandments of God of none effect, whereupon our Saviour saith, “ Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven³.” Thus then I hope it appeareth to all that are not wilfully blinded, that Christ meant not, when he said, “ The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses’ chair, therefore whatsoever they bid you, that observe and do,” that they could speak nothing but truth, and that whatsoever they said was to be received without any examination ; but that whatsoever things they spake *pertinentia ad cathedram* (as the author of the interlineal Gloss⁴ interpreteth the words), and

¹ Matt. xv. 3.

² Matt. xxiii. 18.

³ Matt. v. 20.

⁴ “ ‘ Omnia.’ Ad cathedram pertinentia.”—Glossa interlinearis in loc. [Bibl. Sac. Vulg. &c. Tom. v. col. 377. Antv. 1634.]

whatsoever things they delivered as sitting in Moses' chair, that is, doing the duty of teachers, they should be listened unto, howsoever otherwise they were wicked, and godless men.

They that teach, judge, and rule the people of God, are described to perform those things sitting, to put them in mind that they must do all things with settled, composed, and well-advised resolution, and not rashly, hastily, and inconsiderately: whereupon princes have their thrones, judges their tribunals and judgment-seats, and teachers their chairs. Hence Moses' office of teaching the people the laws of God and the performance of the same, is metaphorically named Moses' chair; and the succeeding of Moses in this office and duty of delivering the laws of God to the people, and the performance of the same, is rightly expressed by the sitting on the chair of Moses: and in this sense the scribes and Pharisees are rightly said to have sat on Moses' chair, because they succeeded him in the office and duty of teaching the people the laws of God, and in the performance of the same duty in some part, though not wholly. And therefore our Saviour Christ requireth all men, notwithstanding their wicked conversation and manifold errors in matters of doctrine, to do whatsoever they commanded, while they sat on Moses' chair, that is, performed the duty belonging to Moses' office and place.

It is strange that any man should seek to extend the words of Christ any farther, as if they meant to clear the scribes and Pharisees from all possibility and danger of erring, in that they possessed the room of Moses, and had the places of teachers in the Church; when it is confessed by the best learned of all sides¹, "that the priests of the law had no privilege of not erring in teaching the people of God after Christ appeared, and began to teach in his own person, whatsoever they had before;" and that this was foretold by Jeremy² the prophet when he said, *Peribit lex a sacerdote, verbum a*

¹ "Respondemus, pontifices et concilia Judæorum non potuisse errare antequam Christus veniret, sed eo præsentē potuisse."—Bellarm. de Conciliorum Auctoritate. Lib. II. cap. 8. [Tom. II. col. 32.]

² "Dico sacerdotes et pontifices non habuisse privilegium non errandi in docendo populo, nisi usque ad tempora Christi, Christo autem præsentē et docente parum oberat illorum error. Immo hoc videtur prædictum per Hieremiam, cap. xviii. cum ait: 'Peribit lex a sacerdote, verbum a propheta, concilium a sapiente.'"—Id. de Ecclesia Militante. Lib. III. cap. 17. [Tom. II. p. 78.]

propheta, consilium a sapiente; “The law shall perish from the priest, the word from the prophet, and counsel from the wise.” But such is the impudency of some of the friends and lovers of the Church of Rome¹, that they fear not to defend and clear the doctrine of the scribes and Pharisees from error, wherewith Christ so often chargeth them, and to justify the proceedings of the high priest and the rest of the priests and rulers assembled in council against Christ himself, affirming, “that the sentence pronounced against him was true and just: for that he was truly guilty of death, in that he had taken upon him our sins to purge them in himself, and that ‘it was indeed expedient that he should die for the people,’ according to the saying of Caiphas², who in so saying is said to have prophesied, as being the high priest that year.” But Bellarmine ingenuously acknowledgeth the oversight of his friends and companions, and saith, “that howsoever those words of Caiphas admit a good sense (though not intended by him), for he meant it was better that Christ being but one should die, than that the whole people (whose destruction he thought unavoidable, if Christ were suffered to live) should perish and come to nothing; yet there are other words of Caiphas that in no sense are justifiable, as when he said, ‘He hath blasphemed; what need we any more witnesses³?’ Touching his former speech, it was the will of God, for the honour of the priesthood, that he should utter that he meant ill in such words as might have a good sense, though not meant nor intended by him, whereupon he is said to have prophesied: but the latter words are words of cursed blasphemy, and without horrible impiety cannot be excused in any sense.” Therefore there are others who confess that Caiphas and his assistants erred when they condemned Christ, but that it was but a matter of fact wherein they erred, in mistaking the quality of Christ’s person, and in being

¹ “Alii dicunt, pontificem et concilium errasse quantum ad errorem propriæ mentis, non tamen errasse in sententia quam protulit. Vere enim Jesus erat reus mortis quia peccata nostra in seipso purganda suscepit, et vere expediebat eum mori pro populo. Quare Joann. cap. 11 dicit Caiapham prophetasse. At licet verba Caiaphæ bonum sensum recipiant, non tamen omnia, cum enim ait de Christo; ‘Blasphemavit, quid adhuc egemus testibus?’ certe tunc non prophetavit sed blasphemavit.”—Id. de Concilii Auctoritate. Lib. II. cap. 8. [Tom. II. p. 32.]

² John xviii. 14.

³ Matt. xxvi. 65.

misinformed of him, in which kind of things councils may err. This conceit the cardinal likewise rejecteth and explodeth as absurd; for that howsoever it was a question of fact, and concerning the person of him that stood to be judged, yet it in-wrapped in it a most important question concerning the faith, to wit, whether Jesus the son of Mary were the true Messias and Son of God; and therefore Caiphas with his whole council resolving that he was not, erred damnably in a matter of faith; and pertinaciously, in that they rejected him as a blasphemer of God, whom the angels from heaven testified to be the Son of God; the star designed to be that light that lighteneth every one that cometh into the world; the sages from afar adored, as being that King of the Jews that is to sit upon the throne of David for ever, whose dominion is from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the land; whom the seas and winds obeyed, and at whose rebuke the devils went out of those they had formerly possessed. But if this defence of the hellish sentence of wicked Caiphas be too weak, as indeed it is, our adversaries' last refuge is, that this council erred, because Caiphas and his fellows proceeded in it tumultuously, and not in due sort: which is a most silly shift. For how are councils privileged from erring, which is the thing these men seek so carefully to defend (though it be with excusing of the fact of those men who shall be found unexcusable in the day of judgment), if councils may proceed tumultuously, and so define against the truth?

Thus we see that the great council of state among the Jews, to which all matters of difficulty were brought, and from which there was no appeal, might and did err sometimes dangerously and damnably. This council continued in some sort as well after the captivity of Babylon, and the return from the same, as before; though with this difference, that whereas before, the king had a principal interest in the same¹, afterwards the high priest always was chief, there being no more kings of Judah, but the kings of Persia, Egypt,

¹ "Judæi post septuaginta servitutis annos permissu Cyri regis Persarum domum ex Babylonia terra reversi principatum, teste Josepho, suis pontificibus mandaverunt, cum reges primum Persarum, deinde Ægyptiorum, tum Syriorum Judæam cum inferio obtinerent ac tributa a Judæis exigent."—Sigonius, De Republica Hebr. Lib. VII. cap. 4. [p. 352.]

and Syria, commanding over the Jews, and making them tributaries unto them. In this sort were they governed, till some differences growing amongst them for the place of the high priest, they were by Antiochus Epiphanes king of Syria deprived both of their liberty and exercise of religion, and brought into miserable bondage; the indignity whereof the Assamonæi of the tribe of Levi could not endure, but by force and policy in a sort freed the state of the Jews again, and took unto themselves first the name of princes, and then of kings. In the book of Maccabees we read, that Mattathias was constituted priest, prince, and ruler, and that many came down to him to seek judgment and justice. Judas Maccabæus succeeded Mattathias, and joined the dignity of the high priest to the princely power. Jonathas succeeded Maccabæus, of whom we read, "Now this day do we choose thee to be unto us a prince instead of Judas, and a captain to fight our battles¹." Simon succeeded Jonathas, and in his time Demetrius king of Syria and Antiochus his son remitted all tributes; so that then the Jews recovered their ancient liberty in as ample manner as they had formerly enjoyed it under their kings. John succeeded Simon, and Aristobulus John, who put upon himself a diadem, and assumed the name of a king. After Aristobulus succeeded Alexander his brother, marrying Solina his wife. Alexander being dead, Alexandra obtained the kingdom, and after her Hircanus, whom Aristobulus his brother expelled. Pompey took this Aristobulus prisoner, subdued Judæa, brought it into the form of a province, and appointed Antipater Ascalonita to be procurator of it; but not long after, Antigonus the son of Aristobulus recovered the city of Jerusalem, and invaded the kingdom; against whom the Romans set up Herod the son of Antipater, and gave him the name of a king.

Thus the direction and government of the Jews rested principally in the Sanhedrim, as well before as after their return from Babylon; and the Sanhedrim, which was the highest court, and swayed all, consisted for the most part of men taken out of the house of David, and therefore the sceptre did not depart from Judah so long as that court continued, and retained the authority belonging to it; though there were no king of the posterity of David and tribe of Judah, but the

¹ 1 Mac. ix. 30.

high priests first, and then other of the tribe of Levi, assuming to themselves priestly and princely dignity, had the chiefest place and highest room in this court of state. But when Herod swayed the sceptre, slew all those that he found to be of the blood royal of Judah, and took away all power and authority that the Sanhedrim formerly had, then the sceptre departed from Judah, and the law-giver from between his feet; so that then was the time for the Shiloh to come.

CHAPTER XI.

OF THE MANIFESTATION OF GOD IN THE FLESH, THE CAUSES THEREOF, AND THE REASON WHY THE SECOND PERSON IN THE TRINITY RATHER TOOK FLESH, THAN EITHER OF THE OTHER.

GOD therefore in that fulness of time sent his Son in our flesh to sit upon the throne of David, and to be both a King and Priest over his house for ever; concerning whom three things are to be considered. First, his humiliation, abasing himself to take our nature, and become man. Secondly, the gifts and graces he bestowed on the nature of man, when he assumed it into the unity of his Person. Thirdly, the things he did and suffered in it for our good.

In the incarnation of the Son of God we consider first, the necessity that God should become man; secondly, the fitness and convenience, that the second Person rather than any other; thirdly, the manner how this strange thing was wrought and brought to pass. Touching the necessity that God should become man, there are two opinions in the Roman schools.

For some think, that though Adam had never sinned, yet it had been necessary for the exaltation of human nature that God should have sent his Son to become man; but others are of opinion, that had it not been for the delivering of man out of sin and misery, the Son of God had never appeared in our flesh. "Both these opinions," saith Bonaventura¹, "are

¹ "Duplex est magistrorum opinio Quidam dicunt quod præcipua ratio incarnationis non est liberatio generis humani, quia

catholic, and defended by Catholics: whereof the former seemeth more consonant to reason, but the latter to the piety of faith; because neither Scripture nor fathers do ever mention the incarnation, but when they speak of the redemption of mankind: so that seeing nothing is to be believed but what is proved out of these, it sorteth better with the nature of right belief, to think the Son of God had never become the Son of man, if man had not sinned, than to think the contrary." *Venit Filius hominis*, saith Augustine¹, *salvum facere quod perierat: si homo non periisset, Filius hominis non venisset; nulla causa fuit Christo veniendi, nisi peccatores salvos facere. Tolle morbos, tolle vulnera; et nulla est medicinæ causa*: that is, "The Son of man came to save that which was lost: if man had not perished, the Son of man had not come; there was no other cause of Christ's coming but the salvation of sinners. Take away diseases, wounds and hurts, and what need is there of the physician or surgeon?" Wherefore resolving with the Scriptures and fathers, that there was no other cause of the incarnation of the Son of God, but man's redemption, let us see whether so great an abasing of the Son of God were necessary for the effecting hereof.

Surely there is no doubt but that Almighty God, whose wisdom is incomprehensible, and power infinite, could have effected this work by other means, but not so well beseeeming his truth and justice; whereupon the divines do show, that in

etiam si homo non peccasset, Christus incarnatus esset. . . . Aliorum vero positio fuit, quod præcipua ratio incarnationis fuit reparatio generis humani. . . . Uterque modus catholicus est, et a viris catholicis sustinetur. Verum autem primus modus magis consonare iudicio rationis, secundus tamen sicut apparet plus consonat pietati fidei. Primo quia auctoritatibus sanctorum et sacræ scripturæ magis concordat. Nam tam novum quam vetus Testamentum ubi de Filii Dei descensu loquuntur, generis humani liberationem reddunt. Et ideo si divina eloquia nobilissimam et præcipuam incarnationis rationem assignant, et nihil etiam a nobis dicendum est præter ea quæ nobis ex sacris eloquiis clarent, ideo magis videtur pietati fidei consonum quod præcipua incarnationis ratio sit liberatio humani generis quam aliter sentire."—Bonaventura in 3 Sent. Dist. i. Quæst. 2. [Tom. v. p. 12. Rom. 1596.]

¹ Aug. de Verb. Apostol. Serm. LXX. tractans illud Lucæ, "Venit Filius hominis salvum facere quod perierat:" et illud 1. ad Timoth. i. "Venit in hunc mundum peccatores salvos facere." [Al. Serm. CLXXV. Tom. v. col. 835.]

many respects it was fit and necessary for this purpose, that God should become man.

First¹, *ad fidem firmandam*, “to settle men in a certain and undoubted persuasion of the truth of such things as are necessary to be believed;” *ut homo fidentius ambularet ad veritatem*, saith Augustine², *ipsa veritas, Dei Filius homine assumpto, constituit et fundavit fidem*; that is, “that man might more assuredly, and without danger of erring, approach unto the presence of sacred truth itself, the Son of God assuming the nature of man, settled and founded the faith, and showed what things are to be believed.”

Secondly, *ad rectam operationem*, “to direct men’s actions;” for whereas man, that might be seen, might not safely be followed, and God, that was to be imitated and followed, could not be seen, it was necessary that God should become man, that he whom man was to follow might show himself unto man, and be seen of him.

Thirdly, *ad ostendendam dignitatem humanæ naturæ*, “to show the dignity and excellency of human nature;” that no man should any more so much forget himself, as to defile the same with sinful impurities. *Demonstravit nobis Deus*, saith Augustine³, *quam excelsum locum inter creaturas habeat humana natura, in hoc quod hominibus in vero homine apparuit*; that is, “God showed us how high a place the nature of man hath amongst his creatures, in that he appeared unto men in the nature and true being of a man.” *Agnosce*, saith Leo⁴, *O Christiane, dignitatem tuam; et divinæ consors*

¹ “Et hoc quidem considerari potest quantum ad promotionem hominis in bonum. Primo quidem, quantum ad fidem quæ certificatur ex hoc quia ipsi Deo loquenti credit Secundo, quantum ad spem, quæ per hoc maxime erigitur Tertio quantum ad charitatem, quæ maxime per hoc excitatur Quarto quantum ad rectam operationem, in qua nobis exemplum se præbuit Quinto, quantum ad plenam participationem divinitatis, quæ vera est hominis beatitudo et finis humanæ vitæ Per hoc instruimur quanta sit dignitas humanæ naturæ ne eam inquinemus peccando quinto ad liberandum hominem a servitute peccati.”—Thomas Aquinas, Summa, Part. III. Quæst. 1. Art. 2. [p. 2. Col. Agr. 1622.]

² August. de Civit. Dei, Lib. xi. cap. 2. [Tom. VII. col. 273.]

³ Aug. de Vera Religione, c. 16. [Tom. I. col. 757.]

⁴ Leo, Serm. I. in Nativ. Dom. [Al. Serm. XXI. Tom. I. col. 66. Ven. 1753.]

factus naturæ noli in veterem vilitatem degeneri conversatione redire; that is, "Take knowledge, O christian man, of thine own worth and dignity; and being made partaker of the divine nature, return not to thy former baseness by an unfitting kind of life and conversation." Lastly, it was necessary the Son of God should become man, *ad liberandum hominem a servitute peccati*, "to deliver man from the slavery and bondage of sin." For the performance whereof two things were to be done: for first, the justice of God displeased with sin committed against him, was to be satisfied: and secondly, the breach was to be made up that was made upon the whole nature of man by the same: neither of which things could possibly be performed by man or angel, or by any creature: for touching the first, the wrath of God displeased with sin, and the punishments which in justice he was to inflict upon sinners for the same, were both infinite; because the offence was infinite, and therefore none but a person of infinite worth, value, and virtue, was able to endure the one, and satisfy the other.

If any man shall say, it was possible for a mere man, stayed by divine power and assistance, to feel smart and pain in proportion answering to the pleasure of sin, which is but finite, and to endure for a time the loss of all that infinite comfort and solace that is to be found in God, answering to that aversion from God that is in sin, which is infinite, and so to satisfy his justice; he considereth not, that though such a man might satisfy for his own sin, yet not for the sins of all other, who are in number infinite, unless his own person were eminently as good as all theirs, and virtually infinite. Secondly, that though he might satisfy for his own actual sin, yet he could not for his original sin, which being the sin of nature, cannot be satisfied for but by him, in whom the whole nature of man in some principal sort is found. Thirdly, he considereth not, that it is impossible that any sinner should of himself ever cease from sinning; and that therefore, seeing so long as sin remaineth, the guilt of punishment remaineth, he must be everlastingly punished, if he suffer the punishment due to his everlasting sin: and consequently, that he cannot so suffer the punishments due to his actual sins, as having satisfied the wrath and justice of God to free himself from the same. If it be said, that by grace he may cease from sinning,

and so suffer the punishment due to sin so ceasing, and not eternal; it will be replied, that God giveth not his grace to any till his justice be first satisfied, and a reconciliation procured: for he giveth it to his friends, not to his enemies.

Touching the second thing that was to be done for man's deliverance, which was the making up of the breach made upon the nature of man, and the freeing him from the impurity of inherent sin, that so the punishment due to sin past being felt and suffered, he might be reconciled to God; it could not be performed by any mere creature whatsoever. For as all fell in Adam, the root and beginning of natural being, who received the treasures of righteousness and holiness for himself, and those that by propagation were to come of him; so their restoration could not be wrought, but by him that should be the root, fountain, and beginning of supernatural and spiritual being, in whom the whole nature of mankind should be found in a more eminent sort than it was in Adam: as indeed it was in the second Adam, "of whose fulness we all receive grace for grace¹." And this surely was the reason why it was no injustice in God to lay upon him the punishments due to our sins, and why his sufferings do free us from the same. It is no way just, that one man having no special communion with another, should suffer punishment for another man's fault; but the whole nature of man being found in him in a more eminent sort, than either in Adam, or any one of them that came of him, and he having undertaken to free and deliver it, it was just and right he should feel the miseries it was subject unto; and that being felt, and sustained by him in such sort as was sufficient to satisfy divine justice, they should not be imposed or laid on us.

Hereupon some have said, that Christ was made sin, not by acting or contracting sin (for so to say were horrible blasphemy), but by taking on him the guilt of all men's sins; which yet is wisely to be understood, lest we run into error. For whereas the guilt of sin implieth two things; a worthiness to be punished, and a destination unto punishment; the former implieth demerit, natural or personal, in him that is so worthy to be punished, and this could not be in Christ: the other, which is *obligatio ad poenam*, "a being subject unto

¹ John i. 16.

punishment," may grow from some communion with him or them that are worthy to be punished. And in this sense some say Christ took the guilt of our sins, not by acting or contracting sin, but by communion with sinners; though not in sin, yet in that nature which in them is sinful and guilty; as those good men that are parts of a sinful city, are justly subject to the punishments due to that city, not in that they have fellowship with it in evil, but in that they are parts of it being evil: as the son of a traitor is justly subject to the grievous punishment of forfeiting the inheritance that should have descended upon him from his father, though he no way concurred with him in his treason, in respect of his nearness and communion with him, of whom he is as it were a part. Whereupon all divines resolve, that men altogether innocent, yet living as parts of the societies of wicked men, are justly subject to those temporal punishments those societies are worthy of; and that the reason why one man cannot be subject to those spiritual punishments which others deserve, is, for that in respect of the spirit and inward man, they have no such derivation from, dependence on, or communion with others, as in respect of the outward man they have.

Wherefore, to conclude this point, we may safely resolve, that no other could satisfy divine justice, and suffer the punishments due to sin in such sort as to free us from the same, but Christ the Son of God, in whom our nature by personal union was found in an excellent sort; and that it was right and just, that having taken our nature upon him, and undertaken to free and deliver the same, he should suffer and endure whatsoever punishments it was subject unto. For the illustration of this point the learned¹ observe, that when God

¹ "Quatuor specialiter virtutibus videre mihi videor amictum fuisse hominem ab ipso suæ creationis exordio. Dederat enim sibi Deus misericordiam ad conservationem; hunc siquidem misericordia custodiebat. Dederat veritatem ad eruditionem; hunc veritas docebat. Dederat justitiam ad directionem; hunc justitia regebat. Dederat et pacem ad delectationem; hunc denique pax fovebat. Sed heu miser, homo descendens de Hierusalem in Hiericho incidit in latrones, quibus suis virtutibus miserabiliter spoliatus accepta perdidit munera deitatis. Sic igitur, pro dolor, virtutes a terra passæ sunt exilium. Sic in cœlum coactæ sunt capere refugium; sicque ipso homine derelicto ad Deum qui eas dederat redierunt.... Factum est itaque in cœlo concilium ut de causa lapsi hominis tractaretur. In quo medius

created Adam, he gave him all excellent and precious virtues, as truth to instruct him, justice to direct him, mercy to preserve him, and peace to delight him with all pleasing correspondence; but that when he fell away, and forgot all the good which God had done for him, these virtues left their lower dwellings, and speedily returned back to him that gave them, making report what was fallen out on earth, and earnestly moving the Almighty concerning this his wretched and forlorn creature; yet in very different sort and manner: for justice pleaded for the condemnation of sinful man, and called for the punishment he had worthily deserved; and truth required the performance of that which God had threatened; but mercy entreated for miserable man made out of the dust of the earth, seduced by Satan, and beguiled with the shows of seeming good; and peace no less carefully sought to pacify the wrath of the displeased God, and to reconcile the creature to the Creator. When God had heard the contrary pleas and desires of these most excellent orators, and there was no other means to give them all satisfaction, it was resolved on in the high council of the blessed Trinity, that one of those sacred Persons should become man, that by taking to him the

pater luminum judicis fungens officio residebat. Ante cujus prospectum virtutes ipsæ quæ dictæ sunt principaliter assistentes super hac re pariter conferebant, et utraque ex parte quod eis videbatur utilius loquebantur. Siquidem veritas et justitia hominem miserum condemnabant; pax vero et misericordia eundem dulciter excusabant. Veritas igitur ac justitia contra homines paratæ ad faciendam vindictam his verbis judicem affabantur. 'Nunquid oportet impleri sermonem quem locutus es Domine. Necesse est ergo ut totus moriatur.' . . . Pax vero et misericordia e contra pro parte hominis pia judicis pulsantes viscera loquebantur. 'Nunquid obliviscetur misereri Deus, aut continebit in ira sua misericordias suas?' . . . Sic igitur grandis erat controversia et intricata nimium disceptatio, nec videbatur quomodo possent erga hominem veritas et justitia ac simul pax et misericordia conservari . . . Unde tandem pius et clemens judex paci et misericordiæ condescendens supra prædicta contentione talem protulit sententiam. 'Pœnitet,' inquit, 'me fecisse hominem. Bonum enim erat si natus non fuisset homo iste. Mihi autem incumbit pœnitentiam agere pro homine quem creavi. Vadam ergo et naturam assumens humanam pro hominis redemptione mortem patiar ab homine.' His itaque auditis factum est quod propheta dixerat: 'Misericordia et veritas obviaverunt sibi: justitia et pax osculatæ sunt.'"—Petrus ab Alliaco Cameracensis in principio ad 3 Lib. Sent.

nature of man he might partake in his miseries, and be subject to his punishments, and by conjoining his divine nature and perfection with the same, might fill it with all grace and heavenly excellency. Thus were the desires of these so contrary petitioners satisfied; for man was punished as God's justice urged; that was performed which God had threatened, as truth required; the offender was pitied, as mercy intreated; and God and man reconciled, as peace desired; and so was fulfilled that of the Psalmist: "Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other¹."

Wherefore now let us proceed to see which of the Persons of the blessed Trinity was thought fittest to be sent into the world to perform this work. Not the Father; for being of none, he could not be sent: not the Holy Ghost; for though he proceed, yet he is not the first proceeding Person; and therefore, whereas a double mission was necessary, the one to reconcile, the other to give gifts to reconciled friends; the first proceeding Person was fittest for the first mission, and the second for the second. Secondly, who was fitter to be cast out into the sea, to stay the tempest, than that Jonas for whose sake it arose? Almighty God was displeased for the wrong offered to his Son, in desiring to be like unto God, and to know all things in such sort as is proper to the only-begotten Son of the Father; therefore was he the fittest to pacify all again. Thirdly, who was fitter to become the Son of man, than he that was by nature the Son of God? *Patrem habuit in cœlis, matrem quæsit in terris*²: "He had a Father in heaven, he sought only a mother on earth." Who could be fitter to make us the sons of God by adoption and grace, than he that was the Son of God by nature? who fitter to repair the image of God decayed in us, than he that was the brightness of glory, and the engraven form of his Father's Person? Lastly, who was fitter to be a Mediator, than the middle Person, who was in a sort a Mediator in the state of creation, and before the fall?

Whereupon Hugo de Sancto Victore bringeth in Almighty God speaking to the sons of men concerning Christ his Son in this sort: *Nolite putare, quod ipse tantum sit Mediator in reconciliatione hominum, quia per ipsum etiam commenda-*

¹ Psalm LXXXV. 10.

² Bernard. De Advent. Dom. Serm. I. [Tom. I. col. 725, Par. 1719.]

*bilis et placita fit aspectui meo conditio omnium creaturarum*¹: that is, “Think not that he is a Mediator only in the reconciliation of men, for by him the condition of all creatures is grateful unto me, and pleasing in my sight.” *Magni consilii angelus*, saith Hugo, *nobis mittitur, ut, qui conditis datus fuit ad gloriam, idem perditis veniat ad medelam*: that is, “The angel of the great counsel is sent unto us, that he who was given unto us, when we were made, to be the crown of our glory, and Prince of our excellency, might relieve, help, and restore us when we were lost.”

Yet our adversaries take I know not what exceptions against Calvin for saying, that Christ was a Mediator in the state of creation; but they should know, that there is a Mediator of reconciliation of parties at variance, and a Mediator of conjunction of them that are far asunder, and remote one from another: and that in this latter sort, between the Father, that no way receiveth anything from another, and the creatures, that so receive their being from another that they are made out of nothing, he may rightly be said to mediate, that receiveth being from another, but the same that is in him from whom he receiveth it. If any man shall say, that the Holy Ghost also in this sort cometh between him in whom the fulness of being is originally found, and the creatures that are made of nothing, as well as the Son, and that therefore in this sense he also may be said to be a Mediator, it is easily answered, that the Son only cometh between the Father, in whom the fulness of being is originally found, and the creatures made of nothing, as he by whom all things were made; the Holy Ghost, as he in whom all things do consist and stand; and that therefore he hath not the condition of a Mediator, being not considered as he by whom all things are bestowed upon us, but as that gift in which all other things are given unto us: so that the Son only is the Mediator, because by him, from the Father, in the Holy Ghost, we receive all that which we have and enjoy.

Neither needeth there any Mediator to conjoin him to us, and us to him: for the medium conjoineth both the extremes, first with itself, and then within themselves, in that it hath something of one of them, and something of another, in some-

¹ Hugo, *Eruditiones Theologicae*. De Trinitatis Summæ per visibilia agnitione, Lib. vii. cap. 24. [Tom. iii. p. 38. Mogunt. 1617.]

thing agreeing with, and in something differing from either of the extremes: so the Son of God agreeth with us, in that he receiveth the being and essence he hath from another, in which respect he is distinguished, though not divided from the Father; but in that the nature he receiveth from the Father is not another, but the same which the Father hath, he is unlike unto us, but agreeth with the Father. And here we may see the malice and ignorance of them that charge Calvin¹ with heresy, for affirming that Christ is *αὐτόθεος*, “God of himself,” as if he denied the eternal generation of the Son of God, and were contrary to the decree of the sacred Nicene council, which defineth that he is *Deus de Deo, Lumen de Lumine*: for these men should know, that Christ may be said to be from another in two sorts; either by production of essence, or by communication of essence: the Nicene council defined that Christ the Son of God who is *ὁμοούσιος*, that is, consubstantial with the Father, is notwithstanding God of God, that is, hath his essence and deity communicated unto him by eternal generation from the Father, even the same the Father had originally in himself. All which Calvin most willingly acknowledgeth to be true, and therefore denieth not but that it may be truly said, according to the sacred decree and definition of that worthy council, that Christ the Son of God is God of God, and light of light; but to imagine, as Valentinus Gentilis and other damnable heretics did, that he is from the Father by production of essence, whence it will follow, that he hath not the same essence with the Father, but another different from it, inferior to it, and dependent on it, is impious and heretical: and in opposition to this impious conceit of these heretics, and in the sense intended by them, Calvin rightly denied Christ to be God of God. For this their conceit was ever detested by all Catholics, as wicked and blasphemous; yea, so far are they

¹ “Genebrardus libro i. de Trinitate, refellit ex professo hæresim quam vocant autotheanorum, id est, eorum qui dicunt Christum esse Deum a seipso non a Patre, et hanc hæresim tribuit Calvino et Bezæ, et in præfatione eorum librorum suspicatur Franciscum Stangarum auctorem primum hujus hæresis fuisse. Gulielmus etiam Lindanus in ii. dialogo, quem inscribit, *Dubitantius*, et Petrus Canisius præfatione libri de S. Joanne Baptista eundem errorem Calvino attribuant.”—Bellarm. de Christo, Lib. ii. cap. 19. [Tom. i. p. 170.]

from approving any such impiety, that no axiom is more common in all their schools, than that *Essentia nec generat, nec generatur*, that is, "The divine essence neither generateth, nor is generated:" and surely, howsoever Kellison¹ in his Survey saith the contrary, and opposeth his affirmative against the negative of all the most famous and renowned schoolmen, yet I am persuaded he did so rather out of ignorance, than any reason leading him so to do, and do think it more than improper and hard to say, that the divine essence doth either generate or is generated.

Thus then Christ is truly said by Calvin to be God of himself, by way of opposition to that kind of being from another, which is by production of essence, and yet is rightly acknowledged by him with the Nicene fathers to be from another, to wit, the Father, and to be "God of God," in that he receiveth the eternal essence by communication from him.

¹ "And to come to Calvin, he sayth plainly that the name of God agreeth to the Father per excellentiam—'by excellence.' Which if it be so, then God the Son is not so excellent a God as the Father, and consequently no God at all. He also in diverse places avoucheth that Christ is not God of God, as the Nicen council calleth him. He denieth that by eternal generation God the Son hath his essence from his Father, yea, (sayth he in the same place) the essence of the Son is no more generated than the essence of the Father. To whom in this point subscribeth our countryman M. Whitaker, in his booke against Father Campian. O blasphemies! and that of them that will nedes be counted reformed Christians. Better were it to deny Christ flatly, than to professe his name, and yet under hand to disgrace him; for dissembled religion is duple iniquitie. Is not Christ God of God the Father? Then is He some other God. Hath He not his essence from his Father? Then is He not the Son of God, because the Son taketh his substance from his Father. Is not the Son's essence generated? Then is not the Son begotten of his Father's substance; then is he not consubstantial to his Father, but rather of another nature, and consequently either a creature or another God. The divines grant that the essence and divinitie absolutely without addition is not sayed to be generated, for then it should be generated in God the Father also; but yet they affirme that God the Son is God of God and begotten of his Father, and that by eternal generation He receiveth without al imperfection his essence from his Father, and consequently that the essence is generated, not absolutely, but in the Son, else were He not a Son, nor should be consubstantial to his Father."—[A Survey of the New Religion, Detecting many Grosse Absurdities which it implieth. Set forth by Matthew Kellison.] Book III. chap. i. [p. 138. Doway, 1605.]

This Bellarmine¹ saw and acknowledged to be true, pronouncing that touching this point Calvin erred not in judgment, and that his opinion is rather an error in form of words, and expressing ill that he meant well, than in the thing itself. That Calvin erred not in the thing itself he delivered, he proveth at large, specially out of the doctrine of Calvin's followers: for Beza in *Axiom. de Trin.* and in the fourteenth axiom, affirmeth, that the Son is from the Father by ineffable communication of the whole divine essence: and Josias Simlerus, in his epistle to the Polonians, defendeth the opinion of Calvin, and expresseth his own opinion and Calvin's in this sort: *Non negamus Filium habere essentiam a Patre, sed essentiam genitam negamus*: that is, "We do not deny the Son to have received his essence from the Father, but that his essence is generated." This doctrine of Simlerus, why it should not be catholic, Bellarmine professeth he cannot see: yet his followers in all their pamphlets traduce Calvin's autotheism as an execrable heresy; and muster the Autotheani, as they call them, amongst the damned heretics of this time; which is not to be marvelled at; for the manner of these men is odiously to object things again and again, that have been often cleared both by themselves and us, little regarding whether it be true or false they say, so they may fasten some note of disgrace upon them whose persons and professions they hate.

One memorable example of hellish impudency in this kind, worthy never to be forgotten, but to be remembered

¹ "Calvinum existimo, quoad modum loquendi, sine dubio errasse, et dedisse occasionem ut de illo scriberem quæ scripta sunt a nostris. Nam passim asserit Filium esse *αὐτόθεον*, hoc est a seipso Deum, et improprie et dure etiam dictum esse in symbolo, 'Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine.' Sed quanquam hæc ita se habeant, tamen dum rem ipsam excutio, et Calvini sententias diligentius considero, non facile audeo pronunciare illum in hoc errore fuisse.

"Probo ex discipulorum ejus doctrina. Nam Beza in axiomatibus de Trinitate, axiome 14, dicit Filium esse a Patre per ineffabilem totius essentiae communicationem ab æterno; et tamen ipse etiam cum suo magistro facit Christum autotheon. Item Josias Simlerus Calvini sectator in epistola ad Polonos, defendit antusian Filii, et sic explicat suam et Calvini sententiam. 'Non negamus,' inquit, 'Filium habere essentiam a Deo Patre, sed essentiam genitam negamus,' quæ Josiæ sententia, non video cur Catholica dicenda non sit."—Bellarm. De Christo, Lib. II. cap. 19. [Tom. I. p. 170.]

and recorded to the shame and reproof of the slandering sect of Papists, we have in Matthew Kellison¹ his late Survey of the New Religion: who, to prove that the Protestants contemn the fathers, affirmeth that Beza called Athanasius (that worthy champion of the catholic faith) Sathanasius, and judged the fathers of the Nicene council to have been blind sophisters, ministers of the beast, and slaves of antichrist: whereas Beza esteemeth of Athanasius as one of the worthiest divines that the world for many ages had, in whose lap and bosom our wearied mother the Church, in her greatest distresses, forsaken of her own children, was forced to repose and lay her head in those restless and confused turmoils during the time of the Arian² heresy: and professeth, that he thinketh the

¹ "Beza calleth Athanasius Sathanasius, and the fathers of the Nicene Council 'blind sophisters,' 'ministers of the beast,' and 'slaves of Antichrist.'"—Kellison, Book I. chap. IV. p. 47.

² "Sed quod tuus Beza novis hodie Arianis respondit, qui se de scripturis certos patrum auctoritatem minoris aestimasse, imo penitus neglexisse, sicuti Lutherus penitus neglexit atque contempsit, asserebant, idem tibi Whitakere responsum accipe. Hoccine est, 'Quæso grata saltem memoria prosecui tot sanctissimorum et eruditissimorum virorum exhaustos pro hac defendenda et ad nos transmittenda veritate labores et vigilias? Miror sane an unquam Lutherus scripta patrum perlegerit quibus ut sophistis convitiatur. Nam si legit eos Lutherus, aut si tu legisti Whitakere, qua fronte tandem ausus ille est, aut audes tu illos patres verbo Dei opponere, quos constat uno Dei verbo nixos fuisse? Sin vero nec Lutherus nec tu illos patres legistis unquam vel certe oscitanter legistis, quis hic pudor est, discipulos sedere suorum magistrorum etiam non auditorum iudices?' Hæc cum tuo Beza."—Stapleton. Triplicat. advers. Whitaker. pro Eccles. Author. [cap. 22. Tom. I. p. 1285. Lut. Par. 1620.]

And the author of the treatise of the Grounds of the Old Religion:—"This forced Beza disputing against such heretiks, to pleade the authority of the councils of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. 'Then which,' saith he, 'the sunne never beheld any thing more holy and excellent from the Apostles daies.' He addeth, that 'Although al use of newe wordes be diligently to be avoided, yet,' saith he, 'I so define, that the difference betweene the *essence* and *hipostasis* being taken away what words soever thou use, and the word *consubstantial* being abrogated,' which words were established in the said councils, 'the deceits and errours of these Arians and Trinitarians can hardly or not at al be discovered, or their errors so clearely confuted. I denie also, that the words *nature*, *propriety*, *hypostatical union*, &c., being taken away, that the blasphemies of Nestorius and Eutiches can

sun in heaven never beheld a more sacred and divine assembly or meeting than that of the Nicene fathers, since the apostles' times: yea, he pronounceth, that there was never any found to resist against the proceedings and decrees of that council, but their woful and unhappy ends made it appear to all the world they were fighters against God; and condemneth the Arians as execrable miscreants, to the pit of hell, for using those words wherewith this surveyor chargeth him. Wherefore let the reader beware, how without due examination he give credit to the sinister reports of these lewd companions, who have sold themselves not only to speak lies but to write them, and leave them upon record to all posterity.

But let us see whether Calvin have not erred at least in the form of words, and ill expressed that he meant well, as Bellarmine chargeth him. Surely we shall find, if we take a view of that which Calvin hath written, that the Cardinal's reprehension of him in this behalf is most unjust: for Epiphanius, a worthy bishop and great divine, writing against heresies, and therefore endeavouring to be most exact in his forms of speech, calleth the Son of God¹ *αὐτόθεον*, as well as Calvin doth. It is true, saith Bellarmine, he doth so: but when he saith, Christ is *αὐτόθεος*, he meaneth only, that he is truly God: whereas Calvin affirmeth, that he is so *αὐτόθεος*, that he is God of himself, which is false: for neither the Father nor the Son is God of himself, the Son being of the Father, and the Father of none, because he receiveth being from none: as if it were so strange a thing to say, God is of himself, or as if it were all one for a thing to be of itself, and to be produced, or to receive being of or from itself. *Omne ens*, saith Scaliger², *aut est a se, aut ab alio*; that is, "Every thing that hath being, either is of itself, or of another." *Cujus rationi*, saith Scotus³, *simpliciter repugnat esse ab alio, illud si potest esse, potest esse a se; sed rationi primi effectivi repugnat esse ab alio: ergo potest esse*

wel be refelled.' Hitherto Beza."—[A Treatise of the Groundes of the Old and Newe Religion] Part I. chap. ix. p. 102. [4to. sin. loc. 1608.]

¹ Epiphanius contra Hæres. Hær. 69. [Hær. Lxxvii. Tom. i. p. 1029. B. Col. Agr. 1682.]

² Scalig. Exercit. Exoteric. vi. § 3. [p. 27. Francof. 1607.]

³ Scotus, i. Sent. Dist. 2. Quæst. 2. [§ 16. Tom. v. p. 249. Lugd. 1639.]

a se, ergo est a se, quia quod non est a se, non potest esse a se: quia tunc non ens produceret aliquid adesse, et idem causaret se, et ita non erit incausabile omnino: “That thing, with the nature and condition whereof it cannot stand, to be of or from another, if it may be at all, it may be of itself: but it standeth not with the nature and condition of the first efficient cause, to be of or from another; therefore it may be, nay therefore it is of itself; because that which is not of itself, cannot afterwards be of itself: for then a thing not being might cause a thing to be, yea, the same might be the cause of itself, and so the highest and first cause of all things might have a cause giving being unto it; which is impossible.” These men feared not to speak as Calvin speaketh, and yet I think Bellarmine dareth not reprehend them also as he doth Calvin; but if he do, I suppose the world will think they knew how to speak as properly as he.

Thus then we see the Son of God is *αὐτόθεος*, that is, God of himself, and that yet he received his essence from the Father, but the same that was in the Father, not another caused, made, or produced by him; and that so he was a Mediator in the state of creation between God and his creatures, in that he was of a middle condition between him that no way was of any other, and those things that by another were made and produced out of nothing, knitting and joining them together in an indissoluble band; and that in this respect he was fittest to become man, and to be a Mediator of reconciliation, when between God and his creatures there was not only a great distance as before, but a great division, difference, and breach also.

CHAPTER XII.

OF THE MANNER OF THE UNION THAT IS BETWEEN THE PERSON OF THE SON OF GOD, AND OUR NATURE IN CHRIST, AND THE SIMILITUDES BROUGHT TO EXPRESS THE SAME.

WHEREFORE let us proceed to see how the natures of God and man were united in Christ, and what kind of union it was that made God to become man, and man God.

For the clearing hereof the divines¹ do note, that there is *Unum per unitatem*, and *Unum per unionem*, that is, “That sometimes a thing is said to be one by unity or oneness, and sometimes by union.” *Unum per unitatem est illud in quo non est multitudo, quod scilicet non est in multis, nec ex multis*: that is, “That thing is one by unity wherein there are not many things found, which neither consisteth in many things, nor of many things: in which sort God only is most properly said to be One, in whom there is neither diversity of natures, nor multiplicity of parts, nor composition of perfection and imperfection, being and not being, as in all creatures. One by union is that, which either consisteth in many things, or of many things; and is either in a sort only, or simply one. In a sort only a thing consisting in or of many things, is said to be one three ways. First, when neither the

¹ “Unum substantialiter dicitur dupliciter, scil. simpliciter, et secundum quid. Unum simpliciter dicitur duobus modis, scil. unum per unitatem, et unum per unionem. Unum per unitatem est illud unum in quo non est multitudo, quod scil. non est in multis nec ex multis, ut Deus. Unum vero per unionem est quod est in multis vel ex multis. Unum secundum quid est unum per appositionem alicujus ad alterum, et hoc unum dicitur tripliciter: quia aliquando unum unitur alteri per appositionem, ita quod neutrum ab altero aliquam contrahit denominationem, nec proprietatem. Aliquando unum apponitur alteri quia unum trahit ab altero proprietatem aliquam, sed non denominationem. Aliquando vero ita quod unum trahit ab altero denominationem sed non proprietatem.

“Unum autem simpliciter quod est unum unione dicitur multipliciter. Uno modo quando aliqua duo uniuntur servata natura utriusque, et sine mutatione naturæ utriusque. Alio modo quando servatur utraque natura, et hoc potest esse dupliciter, quia aut mutatur natura in utroque aut in altero. In altero mutatur natura, sicut quando unus est prædominans in alterum; quia trahit ipsum in suam unitatem vel naturam. Sicut patet in unione multi vini cum parum de aqua in utroque mutatur; sicut in unione aquæ et mellis, quando ex illis componitur tertium. Item unio quando est utraque natura servata est duplex, quia aut ex illis fit tertium; aut non, sed fit unum de altero. Primo modo est unio animæ et corporis in unum hominem compositum ex illis, non enim mutatur natura animæ neque corporis. Secundo modo est unio sicut dicimus quod surculus piri unitur arbori cui inseritur sicut pomo vel alii.

“Unio humanitatis ad deitatem est illa in qua unum fit vel est de altero, et non in qua unum fit alterum, nec in qua unum scil. tertium fit ex illis.”—Alexander ab Ales., Summa Theologiæ, Part. iii. Quæst. 7. Membr. 1. Art. 1. [Tom. iii. p. 42.]

one of the things whereof it consisteth hath denomination from the other, nor the property of it; as when stones are laid together to make one heap. Secondly, when the one hath the property of the other, but no denomination from it; as is the union between the hand and those sweet spices it holdeth in it. Thirdly, when the one hath denomination from the other, but no property of the other; as a man is said to be apparelled from his apparel, but no property thereof passeth from it unto him, as the savour of the sweet spices doth into the hand. Union simply is of diverse sorts. First, when one of the things united is turned into the other; this falleth out so often as there is a repugnance between the things united, and one is predominant, and prevailing, as when a drop of water is poured into a whole vessel of wine. Secondly, when both the things united are changed in nature and essence; and that cometh to pass so often as the things united have a repugnance between themselves, and yet no prevailing of one over the other: in this sort the elements are united to make mixed or compound bodies. Thirdly, when there is no transmutation of the things united, but the constitution of a third nature out of them, because they have no repugnance, but mutual dependence: of this sort is the union of the soul and body. Fourthly, when there is neither transmutation of the natures united, nor constitution of a third out of them, but only the founding, settling, and staying of the one of the things united in the other, and the drawing of it into the unity of the personal being or subsistence of the other; this cometh to pass when there is neither repugnance nor mutual dependence of one of the things united upon the other, but a dependence of another kind: so the branch of a tree being put upon the stock of another tree, is drawn into the unity of the subsistence of that tree into which it is put; and whereas if it had been set in the ground, it would have grown as a separate tree in itself, now it groweth in the tree into which it is grafted, and pertaineth to the unity of it: here is neither mixture of the natures of these trees, nor constitution of a third out of them, but only the drawing of one of them into the unity of the subsistence of the other; so that here is not *Compositio hujus ex his*, but *Hujus ad hoc*¹, that

¹ "Duplex est compositio. Una hujus ex his: alia hujus ad hoc. Prima compositio est sicut compositio hominis ex anima et corpore, ex

is, not a composition of a third thing out of the things united, but an adjoining of one of the things united to the other. And this kind of union doth of all other most perfectly resemble the personal union of the natures of God and man in Christ; wherein the nature of man, that would have been a person in itself, if it had been left to itself, is drawn into the unity of the divine Person, and subsisteth in it, being prevented from subsisting in itself by this personal union and assumption.

This that we may the better conceive, we must consider what the difference is between nature and person, and what maketh an individual nature to be a person. Some think that nature and person differ, as that *Quod est*, and *Quo est*, that is, as the thing that is, and that whereby it is: other, that the condition of personal being addeth to an individual nature a negation of dependence or being sustained by another: but to leave all uncertainty of opinions, to be *this* or *that* is individual, to be *this* or *that* in and for itself, is personal being; to be *this* or *that* in and for another, is to pertain to the person or subsistence of another: so that every thing that is in or for itself is a subsistence or thing subsisting, and every such rational individual nature is a person. Amongst those created things which naturally are apt to make a subsistence, or to subsist in and for themselves, there is very great difference; for some naturally may become parts of another more entire thing of the same kind, as we see in all those things wherein every part hath the same nature and name that the whole hath; as every drop of water is water, and being left to itself is a subsistence in itself, and hath that being, quality, and nature, that is in it in and for itself; but being joined to a greater quantity of water, it hath now no being, quality or operation, but in and for that greater quantity of water into which it is poured. Other things there be, that cannot naturally or by the working of natural causes, put themselves into the unity of any other thing, but by the help of some foreign cause they may be made to pertain to the unity of another thing different in nature and kind: so the branch of a tree of one kind, which put into the ground

quibus tanquam ex partibus consistit intrinsece. Secunda compositio est accidentis ad subjectum, vel subjecti cum accidente."—Durandus a Sancto-Portiano, in 3 Sent. Dist. vi. Quæst. 3. [p. 504. Lugd. 1595.]

would be an entire distinct tree in itself, growing, moving, and bearing fruit in and for itself, may by the hand of man be put into the unity of the subsistence of a tree of another kind and sort, and so grow, move, and bear fruit, not distinctly in and for itself, but jointly in and for that tree into which it is implanted. A third sort of things there are, which being left to themselves become subsistences, and cannot by force of natural causes, nor the help of any foreign thing, ever become parts of any other created thing, or pertain to the unity of the subsistence of any such thing: such is the nature of all living things; and such is the nature of man, which cannot be brought by force of any cause to pertain to the unity of any created subsistence, because it cannot have such dependence on any created thing as is required to make it pertain to the subsistence thereof; yet by divine and supernatural working, it may be drawn into the unity of the subsistence of any of the Persons of the blessed Trinity, wherein the fulness of all being, and the perfection of all created things, is in a more eminent sort than in themselves. For though all created things have their own being, yet seeing God is nearer to them than they are to themselves, and they are in a better sort in him than in themselves, there is no question but that they may be prevented and stayed from being in and for themselves, and caused to be in and for one of the divine Persons of the blessed Trinity. So that as one drop of water, that formerly subsisted in itself, poured into a vessel containing a greater quantity of water, by continuity becometh one in subsistence with that greater quantity of water; and as a branch of a tree, which being set in the ground, and left to itself, would be an entire and independent tree, becometh one in subsistence with that tree into which it is grafted; they both lose their own bounds, within which contained they were distinctly severed from other things, and the relation of being total things; so the individual nature of man assumed into the unity of one of the Persons of the blessed Trinity, loseth that kind of being that naturally left to itself it would have had, which is, to be in and for itself, and not to depend of any other, and getteth a new relation of dependence and being in another: and as it is continuity that maketh the former things one with them to which they are joined; so here a kind of spiritual contact between the divine

Person and the nature of man, maketh God to be man: for as situation and position is in things corporal, so is order and dependence in things spiritual.

There are many similitudes brought by divines to express this union of the Natures of God and Man in the same Christ; as of the soul and body, of a flaming and fiery sword, of one man having two accidental forms, and lastly, of a tree and a branch or bough that is grafted into it. The similitude of the soul and body making but one man is very apt, and used by the ancient¹, yet is it defective and imperfect: first, for that the soul and body being imperfect natures, concur to make one full and perfect nature of a man: secondly, for that the one of them is not drawn into the unity of the subsistence of the other, but both depend of a third subsistence, which is that of the whole; whereas in Christ both natures are perfect, so that they cannot concur to make a third nature or subsistence; but the Eternal Word subsisting perfectly in itself, draweth unto it, and personally sustaineth in it the nature of man, which hath no subsistence of its own, but that of the Son of God communicated unto it. Touching the similitude of a fiery and flaming sword, it most lively expresseth the union of the two Natures in Christ, in that the substances of fire and of the sword² are so nearly conjoined, that the operations of them for the most part concur, and there is in a sort a communication of properties from the one of them to the other: for a fiery sword in cutting and dividing wasteth and burneth, and in wasting and burning cutteth and divideth; and we may rightly say of this whole thing wherein the nature of the fire, and the nature of the steel or iron (whereof the sword is made) do concur and meet, that it is fire, and that it is steel or iron; that this fiery thing is a sharp piercing sword, and that this sharp piercing sword is a fiery and devouring thing: but this

¹ Athanasius in Symbolo.

² “Τίνα τρόπον ἐν σαρκὶ ἡ θεότης; ὥς τὸ πῦρ ἐν σιδήρῳ· οὐ μεταβατικῶς ἀλλὰ μεταδοτικῶς.”—Basil. in Orat. Sanct. Nativ. [Hom. in Sanctam Christi generationem. Tom. II. p. 596, D. Par. 1722.]

“Ἡ δὲ σάρκωσις ταῦτόν δ’ εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐνανθρώπησιν τὴν πρὸς σάρκα, ἥτοι πρὸς ἄνθρωπον συνάφειαν δηλοῖ, καθάπερ καὶ ἡ πύρωσις τοῦ σιδήρου τὴν πρὸς τὸ πῦρ ἔνωσιν.”—Damascen. Orth. Fid. Lib. III. cap. 11. [Tom. I. p. 220. Par. 1712.]

similitude is defective, because the nature of iron is not drawn into the unity of the subsistence of fire, nor the fire of iron; so that we cannot say, this fire is steel or iron, or this steel or iron is fire. The third similitude of one man having two qualities, or accidental forms (as the skill of physic and law), hath many things in it most aptly expressing the personal union of the two natures of God and Man in Christ: for first, in such a man there is but one person, and yet there are two natures concurring and meeting in the same; the qualities are different, and the things had not the same, but he that hath and possesseth them is the same: secondly, the person being but one is denominated from either or both of these different forms, qualities, or accidental natures, and doth the works of them both; and there is a communication of properties consequent upon the concurring of two such forms in one man: for we may rightly say of such a one, This physician is a lawyer; and, This lawyer is a physician: This lawyer is happy in curing diseases, and, This physician is careful in following his clients' causes. Scotus¹ especially approveth the similitude of the subject and accident; first taking away that which is of imperfection in the subject, as that it is potential in respect of the accident to be informed of it, and in a sort perfected by it: secondly, that which is of imperfection in the accident, as that it must be inherent; for otherwise the nature of man is joined to the person of the Son of God *per modum accidentis*, for that *advenit enti in actu completo*², that is, "it cometh to a

¹ "Licet difficile sit videre aliquam dependentiam esse talem, tamen ista potest patere aliquo modo in subjecto et accidente. Accidens enim ad substantiam, sive ad subjectum suum duplicem habet habitudinem, scilicet informantis ad informatum, et ista necessario includit imperfectionem in subjecto informato, eo scil. quod potentialitatem habet respectu actus secundum quid, scil. accidentalis. Aliam habet, ut posterioris naturaliter ad prius, a quo dependet."—Scotus, in 3 Sent. Dist. i. Quæst. 1. [Tom. vii. p. 6.]

² "Potest dici aliquid advenire accidentaliter, quia advenit enti in actu completo absque inhærentia cedens in idem secundum suppositum cum eo cui advenit, sicut si ramus novus inseratur arbori perfecte, et hoc modo potest dici humana natura advenire accidentaliter personæ divinæ; quæ cadit in secundum suppositum, et advenit enti in actu completo absque inhærentia unius ad alteram."—Durandus a Sancto-Portiano, in 3 Sent. Dist. vi. Quæst. 4. [p. 505.]

thing already complete and perfect in itself:" in which sort one thing may be added and come to another, either so as not to pertain to the same subsistence, as the garments that one putteth on; or so as to pertain to the same subsistence, but by inherence; or thirdly, so as to pertain to the same subsistence, without the inherence of the one in the other, by a kind of inexistence, as the branch is in the tree into which it is grafted: which is the fourth¹ similitude, and of all other most perfect. For there are but two things wherein it faileth and cometh too short: whereof the first is, for that the branch hath first a separate subsistence in itself, and after loseth it, and then is drawn into the unity of the subsistence of that tree into which it is implanted: the second, for that it hath no root of its own, and so wanteth one part pertaining to the integrity of the nature of each tree: but if a branch of one tree should by divine power be created and made in the stock of another, this comparison would fail but only in one circumstance, and that not very important; seeing, though the human nature want no part pertaining to the integrity and perfection of it (as the implanted branch doth of that pertaineth to the integrity of the nature of a tree, in that it hath no root of its own), yet the human nature in Christ hath no subsistence of its own, but that of the Son of God communicated unto it; and therefore in that respect it is in some sort like to the branch that hath no root of its own, but that of the tree into which it is implanted communicated unto it. This comparison is used by Alexander of Hales, and divers other of the schoolmen, and in my opinion is the aptest and fullest of all other: for as between the tree and the branch there is a composition, not *hujus ex his*, but *hujus ad hoc*, that is, not making a tree of a compound or middle nature and quality, but causing the branch, though retaining its own nature, and bearing its own fruit, to pertain to the unity of the tree into which it is implanted, and to bear fruit in and for it, and not for itself; so the person of Christ is said to be compounded of the nature of God and man, not as if there were in him a mixed nature arising out of these, but as having the one of these added unto the other in the unity of the same person. And as this tree is one, and yet hath two different natures in it, and beareth two

¹ Alex. ab Ales. [Supra, p. 49.]

kinds of fruit; so Christ is one, and yet hath two different natures, and in them performeth the distinct actions pertaining to either of them. Lastly, as a man may truly say, after such implanting, This vine is an olive-tree, and this olive-tree is a vine; and consequently, This vine beareth olives, and this olive-tree beareth grapes; so a man may say, This Son of Mary is the Son of God, and on the other side, This Son of God and first-born of every creature is the Son of Mary, born in time: the Son of God and Lord of life was crucified, and the Son of Mary laid the foundations of the earth, and stretched out the heavens like a curtain.

CHAPTER XIII.

OF THE COMMUNICATION OF THE PROPERTIES OF EITHER NATURE IN CHRIST, CONSEQUENT UPON THE UNION OF THEM IN HIS PERSON, AND THE TWO FIRST KINDS THEREOF.

HAVING spoken of the assuming of our nature by the Son of God into the unity of his divine person, it remaineth that we speak of the consequents of this union, and the gifts and graces bestowed upon the nature of man when it was assumed. The first and principal consequent of the personal union of the natures of God and man in Christ, is the communication of their properties: of which there are three kinds or degrees. The first is, when the properties of either nature considered singly and apart, as the properties of this or that nature, are attributed to the person from whichsoever of the natures it be denominated. The second is, when the different actions of two natures in Christ concur in the same works and things done. The third, when the divine attributes are communicated unto the human nature, and bestowed upon it. Usually in the schools, only the first degree or kind of communication is named the communication of properties. Which that we may the better understand, we must observe, that there are abstractive and concreative words: the former whereof do precisely note the form or nature of each thing, the latter imply also the person that hath the same nature or form; as, *Humanitas* and *Homo*,

Sanctitas and *Sanctus*, manhood and man, holiness and holy. Secondly, we must observe that abstractive words, noting precisely the distinct natures, cannot be affirmed one of the other, nor the properties of one nature attributed to the other abstractively expressed: for neither can we truly say that Deity is Humanity, or Humanity, Deity; nor that the Deity suffered, or the Humanity created the world; but we may truly say, God is man, and man is God; God died upon the cross, and Mary's babe made the world; because the person which these concretive words imply is one; and all actions, passions, and qualities, agree really to the person, though in and in respect sometimes of one nature and sometimes of another. When we say, God is man and man is God, we note the conjunction that is between the natures meeting in one person; and therefore this mutual and converse predication cannot properly be named communication of properties; but the communication of properties is, when the properties of one nature are attributed to the person, whether denominated from the other, as some restrain it, or from the same also, as others enlarge it. This communication of properties is of divers sorts: first, when the properties of the divine nature are attributed to the whole person of Christ subsisting in two natures, but denominated from the divine nature, as when it is said: "Those things which the Father doth, the Son doth also¹:" secondly, when the properties of the human nature are attributed to the person denominated from the divine nature, as when it is said, "They crucified the Lord of glory²," "They killed the Lord of life³:" thirdly, when the properties of the divine nature are attributed to the person denominated from the nature of man, as when it is said, "No man ascendeth into heaven, but the Son of man that came down from heaven, even that Son of man that is in heaven⁴:" fourthly, when those things that agree to both natures are attributed to the person denominated from one of them, as when the apostle saith, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, which is the man Christ Jesus⁵:" fifthly, when the properties of one nature are attributed to the person, neither denominated precisely from

¹ John v. 19.² 1 Cor. ii. 8.³ Acts iii. 15.⁴ John iii. 13.⁵ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

the one nature nor from the other, but noted by a word indifferently expressing both; as when we say, Christ was born of Mary. If any man list to strive about words not admitting any communication of properties, but when the properties of one nature are attributed to the person denominated from the other, as when we say, The Son of God died on the cross, the Son of Man made the world; besides that he is contrary to the ordinary opinion, he seemeth not to consider, that it is a person consisting in two natures that is noted, by what appellation soever we express the same; and that therefore the attributing of the properties of any one of the natures unto it, may rightly be named a communication of properties, as being the attributing of the properties of this or that nature to a person subsisting in both, though denominated from one.

For the better understanding of that hath been said touching this first kind of communication of properties, and the divers sorts thereof, there are certain observations necessary, which I will here add. The first is, that the communication of properties wherein the properties of the one nature are affirmed of the person denominated of the other, is real and not verbal only. The second, that the properties of the human nature are not really communicated to the divine nature. The third is, that the properties of the divine nature are in a sort really communicated to the human nature; whereof we shall see more in the third kind of communication of properties. The fourth observation is, that in the sacred and blessed Trinity there is *alius et alius*, but not *aliud et aliud*, diversity of persons, but not of being and nature; but that in Christ there is *aliud et aliud*, and not *alius et alius*, that is, diversity of natures, but so that he that hath them is the same: whence it cometh that the properties of either nature may be affirmed of the person, from which soever of them it be denominated; yet so that more fully to express our meaning, it is necessary sometimes to add for distinction sake that they are verified *κατ' ἄλλο, secundum aliud*; that is, according unto the other nature, and not according unto that whence the person is denominated. This explication or limitation is then specially to be added, when such properties of one nature are attributed to the person denominated from the other, as seem to exclude the properties of the other: so

when we say, Christ the Son of God is a creature, we must add, that we neither scandalise them that hear us, nor give any occasion of error, that he is a creature in that he is man.

Now it followeth that we speak of the second kind or degree of communication of properties, which is in that the actions of Christ are *θεανδρικάι*, *Deiviriles*, divinely-human, and humanly-divine, and each nature so worketh its own work, according to the natural property thereof, that it hath a kind of communion with the other. But lest we fall into error touching this point, we must observe, that the actions of Christ may be said to be *Theandrical*, that is, *divinely-human*, three ways. First so, as if there were one action of both natures, and so we must not understand the actions of Christ to be divinely-human, for this is to confound the natures; whereas we must undoubtedly believe, that *Omnia in Christo sunt duplicia, naturæ, proprietates, voluntates, et operationes, sola excepta subsistentia, quæ est una*¹; that is, “that all things in Christ are twofold, or double, as his natures, properties, wills, and actions; his subsistence only or Person excepted, which is but one.” Secondly, the actions of Christ may be said to be Theandrical, that is, divinely-human, for that both the actions of Deity and humanity, though distinct, yet concur in one work; to which purpose Sophronius, in that notable epistle of his which we read in the sixth general Council², doth distinguish three kinds of the works of Christ; making the first

¹ “Περὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς προσκυνητῆς αὐτοῦ κατὰ σάρκα οἰκονομίας ὁμολογοῦμεν πάντα διπλᾶ ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν παράδοσιν διαβεβαιουμέθα· τουτέστι δύο αὐτοῦ τὰς φύσεις κηρύττομεν, τὴν θείαν δηλαδὴ καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐξ ὧν καὶ ἐν αἷς καὶ μετὰ τὴν θαυμαστὴν καὶ ἀχώριστον ἔνωσιν ὑφέστηκε· καὶ μίαν ἐκάστην αὐτοῦ φύσιν ἰδιότητα φυσικὴν ἔχειν ὁμολογοῦμεν. . . . ὁπότεν δὲ δύο φύσεις καὶ δύο φυσικὰ θελήματα, καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ὁμολογοῦμεν ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, οὐκ ἐναντία ταῦτα οὔτε ἀλλήλοις ἀντικείμενα λέγομεν, καθὼς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας πλανώμενοι τῆς ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως κατηγοροῦσιν· ἀπέστω ἡ αὕτη ἀσέβεια ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν τῶν πιστῶν· οὔτε ὡς κεχωρισμένας ἐν δυσὶν προσώποις ἡγουν ὑποστάσεις.”—Epist. Agathonis recitata et approbata in 6 Synodo. Act. i. [Labbe, Concil. Tom. vii. col. 657. Ven. 1729.]

² “Ἐκατέρας φύσεως ἐκατέραν ἴσμεν ἐνέργειαν, τὴν οὐσιώδη λέγω καὶ φυσικὴν καὶ κατάλληλον, ἀδιαιρέτως ἐξ ἐκατέρας προϋούσαν οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως, καὶ τὴν ἐμπεφυκυῖαν αὐτῇ φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη ποιότητα, καὶ τὴν ἀμέριστον ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀσύγχυτον τῆς θατέρας οὐσίας συνεπαγομένην συνεργείαν.”—Concil. VI. Act. 11. [col. 904.]

merely divine, as to create all things; the second merely human, as to eat, drink, and sleep; the third partly divine and partly human, as to walk upon the waters, in which work walking was so human, that the giving of firmness and solidity to the waters to bear the weight of his body, was an action of Deity. Thirdly, the actions of Christ may be said to be Theandrical, that is, divinely-human, in respect of the Person that produceth and bringeth them forth, which is θεάνθρωπος, God-man. In either of these two latter senses, the actions of Christ may rightly be understood to be Theandrical: and that of Leo¹ is most true concerning Christ: *In Christo utraque forma operatur cum alterius communione quod proprium est*: that is, “in Christ both natures do work that which is proper unto them with a kind of communion the one hath with the other:” for this saying is true, first in respect of the Person, and the communion which either nature hath with other therein: secondly, in respect of the work and effect, whereunto by their several proper actions they concur, though in different sort, as in healing of the sick, not only the force of Deity appeared, and shewed itself, but the human nature also did concur; in respect of the body, in that he touched those that were to be healed, laid his hands upon them, and spake unto them; in respect of the soul, in that he desired, applauded, and rejoiced in that which by divine power he brought to pass: thirdly, in that the actions of human nature in Christ have in them a greater perfection than can be found in the actions of any mere man, from the assistance of the Deity that dwelleth bodily in him.

CHAPTER XIV.

OF THE THIRD KIND OF COMMUNICATION OF PROPERTIES, AND
THE FIRST DEGREE THEREOF.

NOW let us come to the third kind of communication of properties, which is that whereby divine and precious things are really bestowed on the nature of man. The things which are thus communicated and bestowed are of two sorts.

¹ Leo, Ep. 10 [Al. xxviii.] cap. 4. [Tom. I. col. 819. Ven. 1753.]

The first finite, and created : as qualities or habits, formally, habitually, and subjectively inherent in the human nature : the second the essential attributes of the divinity itself, communicated to the human nature, not formally by physical effusion, or essential confusion, but by dispensation of personal union. Touching the things of the first sort, there is no question but that they were bestowed upon the nature of man in all perfection, when it was united to the Person of the Son of God : so that in it was found the fulness both of grace and virtue, according to that of St John¹, “The word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us, and we saw the glory of it, as the glory of the only-begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth.” The fulness of grace (as the Schoolmen² excellently note) is of two sorts ; first in respect of grace itself ; and secondly, in respect of him that hath it. The fulness of grace in respect of grace itself, is then when one attaineth to the highest and uttermost of grace, both *quoad essentiam, et virtutem, intensive, et extensive* : in the essence and virtue of it, intensively and extensively, that is, when he hath it as far forth as it may be had, and unto all effects and purposes whereunto grace doth or can extend itself ; as he is said to have life perfectly, or the fulness of life, that hath it not only in the essence, but according to all the operations and acts of life, sensible, rational, intellectual, spiritual, and natural ; in which sort man only hath the perfection and fulness of life in him, and no other thing of inferior condition. This kind of fulness of grace is proper to Christ only, “of whose fulness we all receive³.” The fulness of grace in respect of the subject or him that hath it, is then when one hath grace fully

¹ John i. 14.

² “Respondeo dicendum, quod plene dicitur haberi, quod perfecte et totaliter habetur. Totalitas autem et perfectio potest attendi dupliciter. Uno modo, quantum ad quantitatem ejus intensivam ; alio modo secundum virtutem. Utroque autem modo Christus habuit gratiæ plenitudinem. Primo quidem, quia habuit eam in summo secundum perfectissimum modum quo haberi potest. . . . Secundo ex comparatione ejus ad effectum. . . . Similiter enim quantum ad virtutem gratiæ plene habuit gratiam, quia habuit eam ad omnes operationes vel effectus gratiæ.”—Aquinas, Summa, Part. iii. Quæst. 7. Art. 9. [Tom. iv. Ven. 1594.]

³ John i. 16.

and perfectly, according to his estate and condition, both intensively to the uttermost bound that God hath prefixed to them of such a condition, and extensively in the virtue of it, in that it extendeth to the doing and performing of all those things that may any way pertain to the condition, office, or estate of such as are of his place and rank. In this sort Stephen is said to "have been full of the Holy Ghost¹," who is the fountain of grace; and Mary the blessed Virgin, the mother of our Lord, is by the angel, pronounced, "Blessed amongst women, and full of grace²:" for that she had grace in respect of the essence of it, intensively, in as perfect sort as any mortal creature might have it, and in respect of the virtue of it, extending to all things that might any way pertain to her that was chosen to be the sacred vessel of the incarnation of the Son of God. So that there was never any but Christ whose graces were no way stinted, and to whom the spirit was not given in measure, that was absolutely full of grace; which fulness of grace in Christ the divines do declare and clear unto us wherein it consisted, by distinguishing a double grace in Christ, the one of union, the other of unction, or habitual; and do teach that the grace of union, in respect of the thing given, which is the personal subsistence of the Son of God bestowed on the nature of man formed in Mary's womb (whence that which was borne of her was the Son of God) is infinite, howsoever the relation of dependence found in the human nature, whereby it is united to the person of the Son of God, is a finite and created thing. Likewise touching the grace of unction, they teach that it is in a sort infinite also; for that howsoever it be but a finite and created thing, yet in the nature of grace it hath no limitation, no bounds, no stint, but includeth in itself whatsoever any way pertaineth to grace, or cometh within the compass of it. The reason of this illimited donation of grace, thus without all stint bestowed on the nature of man in Christ, was, for that it was given unto it as to the universal cause, whence it was to be derived unto others.

From the fulness of grace in Christ, let us proceed to speak of the perfection of his virtues also³. Virtue differeth

¹ Acts vii. 55.

² Luke i. 28.

³ "Exemplum patet de radio et lumine in aere; lumen enim et

from grace, as the beam of light from light: for as light indifferently scattereth itself into the whole air, and all those things upon which it may come, but the beam is the same light as it is directed specially to some one place or thing; so grace replenisheth, filleth, and perfecteth the whole soul and spirit of man; but virtue more specially this or that faculty or power of the soul to this or that purpose or effect. In respect of both these the soul of Christ was perfect, being full of virtue as well as grace; whereupon the prophet Esay saith, "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon the flower of Ishai; the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord¹." Wisdom is in respect of things divine: understanding of the first principles; science of conclusions: counsel of things to be done: fear maketh men decline from that which is ill; and strength confirmeth them to overcome the difficulties wherewith well-doing is beset. So that seeing the Spirit that is the giver of all these virtues (within the compass whereof all virtue is confined) is promised to rest on our Saviour Christ, we may undoubtedly resolve, that there is no virtue pertaining to man (neither including in it imperfection, as faith, and hope, nor presupposing imperfection in him that hath it, as repentance, which presupposeth the penitent to be a sinner²) but it was found in Christ's human nature and

radius sunt idem secundum substantiam, quia lumen est substantia radii: differunt tamen secundum rationem et esse, quia lumen dicitur quod perficit aerem indistincte; radius autem dicit illud quod perficit per distinctionem in partibus: quia radius dicit directionem ipsius luminis ad hanc partem aeris, et ad illam; lumen autem non. Similiter in anima lumen est gratia, radius autem virtus; quia gratia quæ est ipsa lux perficit animam tanquam ad essentiam, et indistincte quantum ad omnes vires; virtus autem perficit animam quantum ad partes quæ sunt vires ejus."—Alex. ab Ales, Summa, Part. III. Quæst. 61. Membr. 2. Art. 4. [Tom. III. p. 464. Colon. Agrip. 1622.]

¹ Isai. xi. 2.

² "Dicendum quod non est simile ex parte intellectus et voluntatis. Nam assumere defectum aliquem ex parte voluntatis sive involuntate expediebat, quia hoc faciebat ad nostram redemptionem. Nam sicut Adam peccavit per delectationem inordinatam in voluntate, sic Christus quia venit satisfacere debuit dolere in voluntate. Assumere autem ignorantiam non expediebat; immo magis impediebat ad restaurationem humani generis."—Petrus de Palude, in 3 Sent. Dist. xiv. Quæst. 2. [fol. 76, A. Par. 1517.]

reasonable soul, and that even from the very moment of his incarnation. How is it then, will some man say, that the scripture pronounceth, that he increased¹ in the perfections of the mind, to wit, both in grace and wisdom, as he grew in stature of body. And here that question is usually proposed and handled, whether Christ did truly and indeed profit and grow in knowledge; as not knowing all things at the first, as he grew in stature of body from weak beginnings; or only in the farther manifestation of that knowledge he had in like degree of perfection from the beginning. For the clearing whereof we must note, that there were in Christ two kinds of knowledge, the one divine and increate, the other human and created. Touching the first, there is no doubt but that being the eternal wisdom of the Father, by whom all things were made, he knew eternally all things that afterwards should come to pass; and therefore the Arians impiously abused those places of scripture which they brought to prove that Christ grew in knowledge and learned something in process of time which he knew not before, in that they understood them of his divine knowledge which he had in that he was God; and thereby went about to prove that he was not truly and properly God, nor consubstantial with the Father, but so only, and in such a sense, as that wherein the Apostle saith², "There are many lords, and many gods." The later kind of knowledge found in Christ, which is human, the schoolmen divide into two kinds; the one *in verbo*, the other *in genere proprio*; that is, the one in the eternal Word, wherein he seeth all things; the other, that whereby he seeth things in themselves: for he hath an immediate and clear vision of the Godhead, and in it of all things, and he hath also the knowledge and sight of things in themselves. By virtue³ of the first of these two kinds of human knowledge,

¹ Luke ii. 25.

² 1 Cor. viii. 5.

³ "Anima Christi videndo Deum cognoscit in ipso omnia entia etabilia, quantum ad id quod sunt, de nullo tamen cognoscit ex natura talis visionis, an sit an non. Cujus ratio est illa, intellectus creatus videns clare divinam essentiam videt in ipsa omnia quæ per ipsam naturaliter et ex necessitate repræsentantur; alia vero non, sed essentia divina naturaliter et ex necessitate repræsentat omnes res entes, et posibles, quantum ad illud quod sunt."—Durandus a Sancto Portiano, in 3 Sent. Dist. xiv. Quæst. 2. [fol. 204, B. Par. 1550.]

"Licet cognitio beata simpliciter sit perfectior quacunque cognitione

the soul of Christ, beholding the divine essence, in it seeth all things in respect of that they are, and taketh a perfect view of the essence and nature of everything that is, may be, or is possible to be, as in that sampler according to which God worketh all things: but the actual being of things it cannot know by the vision and sight of God's essence, but merely by his voluntary revelation and manifestation of the same; seeing though the essence of God be naturally a sampler of all things that are or may be, according to which all things are wrought, yet he produceth things voluntarily and according to the good pleasure of his will, and not naturally and necessarily: so that that kind of knowledge which consisteth in the vision of God is more perfect than any other, and only maketh men happy because it is in respect of the best and most noble object. Yet the other kind of knowledge, that maketh us take a view of things in themselves, is more perfect, in that it maketh known unto us the actual being of things, and particular facts, which that happy kind of knowledge of things seen in the glass of the divine essence doth not.

These things thus distinguished, it is easy to conceive how and in what sort Christ grew and increased in grace and wisdom, and how he was full of the same from the moment of his incarnation, so that nothing could be afterwards added unto him: for, concerning his divine knowledge, the perfection of it was such, and so infinite from all eternity, that it is impious once to think that he grew and increased in the same.

Touching the human knowledge he had of things seen in the eternal word, and in the clear glass of the divine essence, it is most probably thought by some of excellent learning¹, that though the soul of Christ had at the first, and brought with it

alia eo quod est nobilioris objecti, tamen alia cognitio videtur esse in aliquo perfectior quantum ad cognitionem rerum creatarum, quia per cognitionem beatam non cognoscitur de rebus an sint an non. Per aliam autem cognitionem cognoscit Christus de rebus an sint. Et similiter de mysteriis divinis, de factis et cogitatis hominum, propter quod non superfluit, immo quoad hoc perficit, vel supplet id quod non habetur per cognitionem beatam.—Ibid. Quæst. 3. [fol. 205, A.]

¹ “Respondetur ad quæstionem distinguendo, quod intellectus animæ Christi potuit in verbo videre omnia habitualiter, non autem actualiter.”—Henric. Quodl. 5. Qu. 14. apud Scot. in 3 Sent. Dist. xiv. Quæst. 2. [Tom. vii. part 1. p. 294. Lugd. 1639.]

into the world a potential ability and aptness to see all things in God, so soon as it should convert itself to a distinct view of them; that yet it did not actually see all things in the essence of God at once from the beginning, but afterwards in process of time: and for the other¹ kind of knowledge and apprehension of things, which he had as beholding them in themselves, they think it was perfect in habit from the first moment of his incarnation, but not in actual apprehension, wherein he did truly increase and grow; as also in experimental knowledge. For the human knowledge that was in Christ was by conversion to those phantasmata and sensible representations of things, that from without are by the senses presented unto the soul; and was discursive, though not proceeding from things known to find out things altogether unknown, yet from things actually known to such as he knew but habitually only, and not actually before. That the human knowledge Christ had of things in themselves was discursive, and by conversion to the sensible representations of them from without, it is evident, in that all perfections are received according to the condition and capacity of the receiver. Now the condition of the soul of man in the state of this life is, to know nothing but by conversion to the sensible appearances of the same, and that not only in respect of things natural, but mystical also and supernatural: *Quia impossibile est*, saith

¹ “Quarto quæritur sine argumentis, utrum Christi anima noverit omnia perfectissime in genere proprio? Respondeo, quod potest intelligi de cognitione actuali vel habituali.

“De habituali dico quod perfectissime novit, quia sicut positum est istam animam posse habere summam gratiam possibilem creaturæ; ita probabile est quod habeat species intelligibiles perfectissimas, per quas intelligit perfectissime res cognitione abstractiva habitualiter.

“Si autem quærat de actuali, tunc distinguendum est de abstractiva et intuitiva: quantum ad abstractivam non potest perfectissime noscere ex ea parte qua intellectus est causa partialis respectu intellectionis; quia intellectus suus non est perfectissimus intellectus creatus, et quanto ista causa partialis est imperfectior, tanto intellectio est imperfectior. De intuitiva autem cum ibi objectum non ut in specie agat, sed ut in se præsens, et ut in se præsens est idem, et eodem modo cum quocunque operetur, sequitur quod intellectus cujus intellectualitas est imperfectior, habebit illum actum imperfectiorem; sed de intuitiva in verbo potest dici intellectus ille perfectissime videre, sicut et videt verbum.”—Scotus, *ibid.* Quæst. 4. [p. 308.]

Dionysius Areopagita¹, *nobis aliter superlucere radium divinum, nisi sacrorum velaminum varietate circumvelatum*: that is, “because it is impossible the beam of divine light should shine on us, unless it be veiled on every side with the variety of sacred veils.”

Thus then we see how it may be truly said, that Christ grew in wisdom and knowledge, as he did in stature of body, *non quoad habitus essentiam et extensionem, sed quoad actualement cognitionem et experimentum*: that is, “not in respect of the essence or extension of the habit, but of actual knowledge and experience.” That which Thomas and others have, that Christ knew all things at first by an infused knowledge, and afterwards attained another kind of knowledge of the same things, which they named *acquisite*, is not so fit: for two forms or qualities of one kind cannot be in the same subject. Now as the sight which is in men naturally, and that which once lost is restored again by miracle, is of the same nature and condition; so is that knowledge of things that is by infusion, and that which is *acquisite*; howsoever these men seem to make them of two kinds. Wherefore passing by this conceit as not probable, to conclude this point, even as touching the condition of children, which should have been born in the state of innocency, there are divers opinions²; some thinking they should have had the use of reason and perfection of knowledge at the very first, so that they should have grown and increased afterwards only in experimental knowledge; others, that they should have had no use of reason at the first; and a third sort, that so soon as they

¹ Dionys. citat ab eodem Durand. Ib. Quæst. 3. [fol. 205, A.]

² “Quibusdam videtur dicendum quod statim parvuli habuissent rationis usum, cum corpus non aggravaret spiritum, profecissent tamen in scientia per experientiam, sicut etiam datum erat eis proficere in justitia et bona vita per obedientiam. Aliis videtur, quod parvuli non statim habuissent usum rationis, sicut nec in matrum uteris. . . . Quod autem verius sit, difficile est videre. Possumus tamen sine prejudicio mediam viam tenere; ut dicamus, quod parvuli illi statim noscerent quod pro illo tempore esset naturæ suæ consonum, vel nocivum; et hoc per industriam naturalem. Si enim natura hoc concessit agriculis, ut per instinctum naturæ lupum refugiant, quem nunquam viderunt, et mamillas matrum requirant, nequaquam credendum est, hoc filiis Adæ fuisse negatum.”—Alex. ab Ales, Summa, Part II. Quæst. 89. Membr. 2. [Tom. II. p. 356. Colon. Agr. 1622.]

had been born they should have had the use of reason, so far forth as to discern outward things good or evil (seeing even the little lambs by nature's instinct do know the wolf, and fly from him, and seek the dugs of their dams), but not to discern things concerning moral virtue and the worship of God. So likewise some think that the babe Jesus, even in his human soul, had the actual knowledge of all things even from the beginning, and that he grew only in experimental knowledge: but there are other, of as good judgment and as great learning, who think that howsoever he had the habit of all knowledge from the beginning, and brought it with him out of the womb, yet not the act and use of it: and this is all that either Luther or Calvin say; and yet we know how clamorously some inveigh against them, as if they had broached some damnable heresy. But some man will say, "If we grant that Christ in his human soul knew not all things from the beginning, but in process of time learned that which before he actually knew not, we fasten on him the disgraceful note of ignorance, and consequently bring him within the confines and compass of sin." Hereunto Hugo de S. Victore¹ answereth, and sheweth the folly of this silly objection, peremptorily resolving, that *non omnis qui aliquid nescit, aut minus perfecte scit, statim ignorantiam habere, seu in ignorantia esse dicendus est; quia ignorantia non dicitur, nisi tunc solum, cum id quod ignorari non debuisset nescitur*: that is, "we must not say that every one that knoweth not a thing, or doth less perfectly know it, is ignorant, or in ignorance; because ignorance is only the not knowing of such things as should have been known. Neither is there any distinction more trivial or ordinary in the schools than that of nescience and ignorance; and therefore howsoever some in the heat of their distempered passions lay a heavy imputation of horrible impiety upon Luther, Calvin, and others, for that they say there were some things which Christ in his human soul did not actually know from the beginning; yet Maldonatus², a man as ill con-

¹ Hugo de Sancto Victore, De Sacram. Fid. Lib. i. part vi. cap. 26. [Tom. iii. p. 538.]

² "Objiciebant Ariani Deum non esse, qui spiritu sapientiaque profecisset. Respondebant varie catholici, quidam profecisse quidem vere, sed humana non divina sapientia, et profecisse ut hominem non ut Deum. Libenter hanc sententiam omnes hæretici novi, Lutherani

ceited of them as any other, confesseth that though some say Christ profited in wisdom and knowledge, not in his own person, but in his mystical body which is the Church; others, that his growing and increasing was only in the manifestation of that which in all perfection was found in him from the beginning, or in experimental knowledge of those things which in general contemplation he knew before; yet many of the ancient fathers, answering the objections of the Arians and other like heretics, and rejecting as impious their conceit who thought Christ was absolutely ignorant of any thing, denied not but that there were some things which Christ in his human nature did not actually always know. "This," saith Maldonat, "I suppose Luther, Calvin, and the rest knew not; for had they known that the fathers taught that Christ did truly grow in human knowledge and wisdom, and that he knew not all things actually from the beginning, to be contrary to the fathers, they would have been of another mind." How charitable this his surmise and conjecture is, let the reader judge. Howsoever we have his clear confession, that many of the fathers were of opinion, that Christ in his human nature did not always actually know all things: yea, upon the xxivth of Matthew he testifieth, that many of them said plainly¹ that Christ as man knew not the day appointed for

et Calviniani amplexi sunt. Magis ferendum si eorum quos nominavimus patrum auctoritate commoti fecissent; sed ut puto nesciebant eam aliquorum patrum fuisse sententiam, non secuturi fortasse si scivissent. . . . Hoc aliquorum veterum auctorum responsio non immerito est a posterioribus repudiata. Et vero illi ipsi qui ejus fuerunt auctores, Athan. et Cyrillus quasi ea non satis fidentes alias adhibuerunt. Non vero in se profecisse sed in nobis, quia ut nos spiritu sapientia et gratia proficeremus effecit, itaque non de propria Christi persona sed de persona corporis ejus quod est ecclesia, ut multa alia, id esse dictum. Item quod rem magis continet, non vere ac re ipsa, sed demonstratione, ostensioneque, et hominum opinione profecisse, quod illi quos diximus, et alii omnes veteres recentioresque auctores docuerunt."—Maldonat. in Luc. ii. 40. [col. 123. Mogunt. 1596.]

¹ "Gravius hoc loco catholicis cum Arianis quæstio fuit dum hinc Ariani Christi divinitatem refutare conarentur, quod Christus diem judicii diceretur ignorare. Nonnulli veteres auctores testimonii difficultate pressi eo confugerunt, ut locum vitiatum esse dicerent, nec legendum esse, 'neque filius, nisi pater.' Alii Christum ignorasse quidem diem judicii quamdiu in hac vita fuit, scivisse vero simul atque ad patrem ascendisset. Sic Origenes, Tract. 30 in Matth., cum hæc

the general judgment of the quick and dead, when he said, "That day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels, nor the Son himself, but the Father only." It is true indeed that he goeth about, notwithstanding this his clear confession of the truth, to construe the words of some of the fathers in such sort, as if they had not meant simply, that Christ in his human soul knew not that hour and time, but only that he knew it not by force of his human nature; but this commentary (I fear) will not agree with their texts: for Origen in his third tract upon Matthew saith, that Christ knew not the time and day of judgment, when he said, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the Son;" but that afterwards he knew it, when he was risen, and appointed of his Father king and judge: which words of his admit no such gloss. Wherefore Jansenius¹ saith, there are two principal interpretations of those words of Christ, when he saith, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the Son;" the

Christus dicebat, eum diem judicii ignorasse scribit, post resurrectionem vero scivisse, quod tunc rex, et judex a Patre constitutus sit. . . . Multi veteres et graves auctores aperte docuerunt, Christum quatenus hominem diem judicii ignoravisse. Quod etsi auditione prima horrendum videtur esse, adhibita tamen interpretatione verum habere potest sensum.—Id in Matth. xxiv. 36. [col. 495.]

¹ "Inter varios modos quibus varie ostenditur quomodo illud accipi possit, duo sunt præcipui. Alter ut dicatur filium dictum ignorare quatenus erat homo. Quod tamen rursum dupliciter intelligi potest. Nam si quidem, ut habet communis sententia, Christus ab initio suæ conceptionis per infusam scientiam omnium habuit cognitionem, ut intelligitur profecisse sapientia, solum ob id quia sapientiæ majorem cum ætatis accessu edidit demonstrationem; jam Christus, quatenus homo intelligendus est ignorare diem judicii, cognitione et scientia naturali aut scientia acquisita. Si autem intelligatur Christus quatenus homo vere profecisse sapientia, sicut vere profecit ætate, nec omnium cognitionem mox ab initio illi fuisse infusam, jam etiam videtur intelligi posse Christum quatenus homo necdum cognovisse absolute diem judicii, cum hæc diceret, quamvis post resurrectionem et ascensionem jam cognoscat. Hoc modo num præsens locus intelligi possit, expendendum inter varios quos affert sensus, relinquit Origenes. Certe Cyrillus libro nono Thesauri, capite 4, fatetur Christum de se quatenus homo erat, dixisse quod ignoraret diem judicii, quod proprium sit humanæ naturæ ignorare futura.

"Alter modus explicandi, et quidem melius, hunc locum est, ut intelligatur Christum dicere se ignorare illum diem et horam, quod non sic eum a Patre didicisset et accepisset, ut hominibus illum aperire et

one, that he said he knew it not, because he knew it not to reveal it, and because his body the Church knew it not; the other, that he knew it not as man: and this interpretation he showeth to be likewise two-fold: for, saith he, if we follow the common opinion that Christ had the perfect knowledge of all things in his human soul at the first, then we must understand that Christ said he knew not the day of judgment, because he knew it not by natural and acquiste knowledge, but by virtue of that knowledge that was infused into him; but if we follow the other opinion, that Christ had not perfect knowledge of all things in his human soul at the first, but grew in it, then, as Origen among other senses delivereth, the meaning of the words is, that he knew it not till after his resurrection.

And surely Cyril¹, a worthy bishop, and one that had many conflicts with the Nestorian heretics who divided the person of Christ, feareth not directly to say, that Christ as man knew not the day appointed for the general judgment, when he used the words before mentioned. Neither is this the heresy of the Agnoetæ, as some ignorantly affirm: for their error was, that the Deity of Christ was ignorant of something, or that Christ in his human nature was properly ignorant, that is, knew not such things, and at such time, as he should have known; and that he is still ignorant of sundry things in the state of his glorification; as it appeareth by that Epistle of Gregory², in which one of them allegeth, that as

indicare deberet, quem præcognoscere hominibus non expediebat, ut semper incerti de adventu judicis, sic vivant quotidie, quasi die alio sint judicandi.—Jansenius, Comment. in suam Concordiam Evangelicam, cap. 123. [p. 109. Mogunt. 1612.]

¹ “Εἰ δὲ τόπον οἰκονομίας εἰσάγεσθαι τίνα διὰ τοῦτο δώσετε, μὴ ξενί-
ξεσθε, καὶν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, δι’ οὗ καὶ τότε τὴν ἐρώτησιν πρὸς τε Ἀδὰμ
καὶ τὸν Κάϊν ἐποιεῖτο Θεὸς, οἰκονομῶν τι χρήσιμον μὴ εἰδέναι λέγει τὴν ἡμέ-
ραν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, καίτοι πάντα εἰδὼς ὡς σοφία τοῦ Πατρὸς.”—Cyril. Alex.
Thesaur. [Assert. 32. Tom. v. part 1. p. 223. Lut. 1638.]

² “Ad hoc vero mihi idem communis filius Anatolius diaconus respondit aliam quæstionem, dicens, Quid si objiciatur mihi, quia sicut immortalis mori dignatus est ut nos liberaret a morte, et æternus ante tempora fieri voluit temporalis, ita Dei sapientia ignorantiam nostram suscipere dignata est, ut nos ab ignorantia liberaret.”—Greg. Epist. Lib. viii. Ep. 42. [Al. Lib. x. Ep. 39. Tom. ii. col. 1071. Par. 1705.]

“Οἱ γοῦν ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ Ἀκεφάλου Σεβήρου, οὐ μόνον Ἀγνοῶται, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σεβηρίται ἔσχον ἐπὶ κλήσιν· οἱ καὶ λέγουσι τὸν Θεὸν λόγον πάντα μὲν

Christ took our nature, so he took our ignorance, to free us from the same : and therefore Maldonatus¹ upon the xxivth of Matthew saith, that the Themistians, called also Agnoetæ, were accounted heretics, not for saying Christ knew not the day of judgment, as *Damascene de hæresibus*² testifieth ; but that, as may be gathered out of the same Damascene, they simply, without all distinction of the divine or human nature, said Christ was ignorant thereof, because they thought the divinity was turned into the humanity.

CHAPTER XV.

OF THE THIRD KIND OF COMMUNICATION OF PROPERTIES, AND
THE SECOND DEGREE THEREOF.

THUS having spoken of those finite and created things that were bestowed on the nature of man when it was assumed into the unity of the divine person, let us come to those things that are infinite. Where first we are certainly to resolve, that as the nature of man was truly given and communicated to the Person of the Son of God, so that he is indeed and really Man ; so the Person of the Son of God was as truly communicated to the nature of man, that it might subsist in it, and that that which was fashioned in the womb

γινώσκειν, πάμπολλα δὲ ἀγνοεῖν, τὴν ἐνωμένην αὐτῷ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἀνθρωπότητα ἔτι γε μὴν ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν τῆς παγκοσμίου συντελείας, οἷα ἐλάττονα τοῦ Πατρὸς.”—Niceph. Hist. Eccles. Lib. xviii. cap. 50. Tom. ii. p. 878. Lut. Par. 1630.]

¹ “Habiti sunt Themistiani cognomento Agnoetæ pro hæreticis, quod docuerint Christum diem judicii ignorasse, ut Damascenus in libro de hæresibus auctor est. Verum illi, ut ex eodem Damasceno colligitur, simpliciter, et sine ulla distinctione divinæ humanæque naturæ ignorantiam Christo tribuebant, quia credebant divinitatem in humanitatem fuisse conversam.”—Maldonat. in Matt. xxiv. 36. [col. 516. Lugd. 1598.]

² “Ἀγνοῆται, οἱ καὶ Θεμιστιανοί· οἱ ἀγνοεῖν ἀσεβῶς καταγγέλλοντες τὸν Χριστὸν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς κρίσεως, καὶ δειλίαν αὐτοῦ καταγράφοντες· Οὗτοι δὲ ἀπόσχισμα τῶν Θεοδοσιανῶν εἰσὶν· ὁ γὰρ Θεμίστιος ὃς ἐγένετο αὐτῶν αἵρεσιάρχης μίαν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ φύσιν σύνθετον ἐπρέσβευεν.”—Joann. Damascen. de Hæres. [§ 85, Tom. i. p. 107. Par. 1712.]

of the blessed virgin, and born of her, might not only be holy, but the holiest of all, even the Son of God. Secondly, that in this sense the fulness of all perfection, and all the properties of the divine essence, are communicated to the nature of man in the Person of the Son: for as the Father communicated his essence to the Son by eternal generation, who therefore is the second Person in Trinity, and God of God; so in the Person of the Son he really communicated the same to the nature of man formed in Mary's womb, in such sort that that Man that was born of her is truly God. And in this sense the German divines affirm that there is a real communication of the divine properties to the nature of man, in the personal union of the natures of God and Man in Christ; not by physical communication, or effusion, as if the like and equal properties to those that are in God were put inherently into the nature of man, in such sort as the heat transfused from the fire into the water is inherent in it, (whence would follow a confusion, conversion, and equalling of the natures, and natural properties) but personal, in the Person of the Son of God: for as the Person of the Son of God, in whom the nature and essence of God is found, is so communicated to the nature of Man, that the Man Christ is not only in phrase of speech named God, but is indeed and really God; so he is as really omnipotent, having all power both in heaven and earth. "There is one Christ," saith Luther¹, "who is both the Son of God and of the virgin. By the right of his first birth, not in time but from all eternity, he received

¹ "Idem est et unus Christus, Dei et virginis Filius. Sed is ex illa priore nativitate, non in tempore, sed ab æterno a Deo Patre accepit illam æternam potentiam, hoc est, ipsam divinitatem, et hanc ei æternus Pater omnem et integram ab æterno tradidit, ita ut eam ipse æternam habet. . . . Quod attinet ad alteram in tempore cœptam humanam naturam Christi, sic quoque data est ei æterna potentia Dei, sed ut dixi, non ab æterno, vel ante initium temporis. Cæterum ab eo ipso momento temporis, cum divina natura conjuncta et unita est humana in unam personam, ab eo inquam articulo, hic virginis filius vere est et dicitur Deus æternus. 'Mihi,' inquit. . . . 'Etsi enim ab æterno mea est hæc potestas, antequam humanam naturam assumpsit, tamen postquam homo esse cœpi jam etiam secundum humanam naturam eandem potestatem in tempore accepi, sed etiam nondum quidem palam ostendi hoc meo tempore infirmitatis et crucis.'"—Luther. De novissimis verbis Davidis, Tom. III. fol. 91. [Witteberg. 1583.]

all power, that is, the Deity itself, which the Father communicated to him eternally: but touching the other nature of Christ, which began in time, even so also the eternal power of God was given unto him; so that the Son of the Virgin is truly and really eternal God, having eternal power, according to that in the last of Matthew¹, 'All power is given unto me both in heaven and in earth.' And of this power a little after he bringeth in Christ speaking in this sort: 'Although this power was mine eternally, before I assumed the nature of man, notwithstanding after I began to be man, even according to the nature of man I received the same power in time, though I shewed it not during the time of my infirmity and cross.'" Bonaventura² saith the very same in effect that Luther doth: "When it is said," saith he, "speaking of the Man Christ, 'This man is everywhere,' this may either note out the Person of Christ, or the singular and individual nature of a man: if the Person of Christ, there is no doubt but the proposition is true; if the individual nature of a man, yet still it is true, not by propriety of nature, but by communication of properties; because that which agreeth to the Son of God by nature, agreeth unto this Man by grace." Cardinal Cameracensis³ agreeth with Bonaventura, affirming, that the divine attributes and properties are more really communicated to the Man Christ, than the human are to the Son

¹ Matth. xxviii. 18.

² "Cum dicitur, 'Iste homo est ubique,' hoc pronomen *iste* potest demonstrare personam Christi vel singulare hominis. Si personam Christi, sic absque dubio ista vera est, 'Iste homo est ubique.' Si vero singulare hominis, adhuc vera est: sed non per propriam naturam sed per communicationem idiomatum, quia quod convenit Filio Dei per naturam convenit isti homini per gratiam."—Bonaventura, in 3 Sent. Dist. xxii. Qu. 2. [Tom. v. p. 260. Rom. 1596.]

³ "Itaque est verum dicere quod 'Hic homo est Filius Dei, æternus, immensus, creator mundi, &c.' et etiam e converso ea quæ dicuntur de natura assumpta in concreto sub hoc nomine *homo* verificantur de Christo sub hoc nomine *Deus*. . . . Sed dico quod non consimiliter seu æque proprie dicuntur prædicata divina de hoc homine et humana prædicata de Deo: eo quod in Christo persona divina est assumens et natura humana assumpta. Unde magis proprie de Christo dicitur, 'Iste homo est immortalis,' absque hoc quod addatur, secundum divinitatem, quoniam iste homo est proprie persona divina, quam dicatur, 'Deus est mortalis.'"—Petrus ab Alliaco Cameracensis, in 3 Sent. Quæst. 1. [Art. 1. fol. 206, B. Par. sin. ann.]

of God: and that therefore a man may most truly and properly say, speaking of the Man Christ, This Man is immortal, almighty, and of infinite power and majesty; because he is properly the divine Person, and so consequently truly and really immortal and omnipotent. Yea, Bellarmine¹, though he impugn the errors of the Lutherans (as he calleth them) with all bitterness, yet confesseth all that hitherto hath been said to be most true. “I say,” saith he, “as before, that the glory of God the Father was given to the humanity of Christ, *non in ipsa*, not to be formally or subjectively inherent in it, but in the divine Person; that is, that by grace of union the human nature of Christ obtained to be in such sort the nature of the Son of God, that the Man Christ should be truly and really in the glory of God the Father, filling both heaven and earth.” Again he saith, “Those places, ‘All things are given me of my Father²,’ and, ‘All power is given me both in heaven and earth³,’ may be understood, first, of divine power which the Son of God received of the Father by eternal generation; and secondly, of divine power, which the nature of man received by personal union.” And in another place, speaking of sundry things proper to God, he saith: “All those things may be said to be communicated and given to the human nature, not formally in itself, but in the Person of the Son of God by the grace of union⁴.”

¹ “Respondeo, ut supra, datam esse gloriam Dei Patris humanitati Christi, non in ipsa, sed in supposito; id est, per gratiam unionis accepisse Christi humanitatem, ut esset natura Filii Dei, et proinde illum hominem Christum esse in gloria Patris, et terram pugillo continere, et cœlum et terram implere.

“Tertium argumentum, Matt. xi. ‘Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo.’ Et Matt. ult. ‘Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo et in terra.’ Quo loco omnis potestas notat omnipotentiam in cœlo et in terra: omnipræsentiam, proinde Christus vere præsens omnia gubernat. Respondeo, priora duo loca posse intelligi dupliciter. Primo, de potentia divina quam accepit Filius Dei per æternam generationem, et tunc non sunt hæc loca ad propositum. Secundo, de potentia divina quam accepit natura humana per unionem hypostaticam, et tunc eadem est responsio quæ ad superiora argumenta.”—Bellarm. De Incarnatione, Lib. iii. cap. 16. [Tom. i. p. 207.]

² Matt. xi. 27.

³ Matt. xxviii. 18.

⁴ “Ex unione hypostatica sequitur communicatio idiomatum, quæ quidem communicatio non est realis respectu ipsarum naturarum, . . . sed ex respectu hypostasis utriusque naturæ.”—Id. [cap. 9. p. 200.]

The divines distinguish the properties of God, and make them to be of two sorts, communicable and incommunicable. Communicable properties they define to be those perfections that are called *perfectiones simpliciter*, which are found without mixture of imperfection in God, and in a more imperfect sort in the creatures. These they name *perfectiones simpliciter*, that is, simply and absolutely perfections, because it is better for anything to have them, than not to have them; and because those things are better that have them, than those that have them not: as likewise, for that they imply in them no imperfection, though they be mingled with imperfection and defect in the creatures. Of this sort is life, which it is better to have than not to have; and it includeth in it no imperfection, though it be accompanied with defect and imperfection in many of the things wherein it is found: for that life that is in trees is an imperfect life; and the life of men, who in truth then begin to die when they begin to live, is imperfect; yea, the life of angels is imperfect, because if they be not continually sustained, they return to that nothing out of which they were made. Of the same kind are truth, goodness, justice, mercy, wisdom, knowledge, and understanding: and therefore all these, separated from that imperfection that cleaveth unto them elsewhere, are found in God, and may truly be attributed unto him. Incommunicable properties are nothing else but the negation and removing of all that imperfection that is in the creatures, of which sort are immortality, eternity, immensity, infinity, and the like, all importing a negation of imperfection. The former of these two sorts of divine properties which are named communicable, are communicated to mere creatures in some degree and sort, though in highest degree they are no where found but in God; and with the addition of words expressing such eminency they may be attributed to none but to God; for he only is Almighty, most wise, most just, and most merciful: but both these with addition of highest degree, and the other which are named incommunicable, are by all divines confessed to be in such sort communicated in the Person of the Son of God to the nature of man assumed into the unity of the same, that the Man Christ, and the Son of Mary, is not in title only, but really and indeed, most wise, most just, omnipotent, incomprehensible, eternal, and infinite.

And this is all, as I think, that the divines of Germany the followers of Luther mean, when they speak of the real communication of divine properties to the human nature in Christ. If any man say, that they may justly be thought to proceed farther, and to understand some other communication of properties than that by us expressed, in that they do not only say concretively, that the Man Christ is omnipresent, but the humanity also; it may be answered, that when we speak of the humanity of Christ, sometimes we understand only that human created essence of a man that was in him, sometimes all that that is implied in the being of a man, as well subsistence as essence. In the former sort, it is absurd and impious to think that the humanity of Christ, that is, the created essence of a man in him, is omnipotent, omnipresent, or infinite; neither do they so think; but they affirm that the subsistence of the Man Christ implied in his being a Man is infinite and omnipresent, as being the subsistence of the Son of God communicated to the nature of Man, instead of that finite subsistence, which, left to itself, it would have had of its own.

Much contention there hath been between them and other touching the ubiquitary presence of the humanity of Christ; but I verily think it hath been in a great part upon mistaking, and because they understood not one another: for the followers of Luther confess that the body of Christ is only in one place locally, and do not think it to be everywhere in extent of essence diffused into all places, but say only that it is everywhere in the infiniteness of the subsistence of the Son of God communicated to it. "If we ask them," saith Zanchius¹, "whether Christ's body be every-

¹ "Intelligo quidem communicatione *ἰδιωμάτων*, sicut recte dicitur Christum Deum passum et mortuum esse, ita etiam orthodoxe dici, Christum hominem, i. e. illam personam quæ non solum Deus est sed etiam homo, ubique esse. At corpus Christi quod una tantum pars est humanæ naturæ in Christo sua substantia, i. e. secundum esse (ut loquuntur scholastici) naturale quod accepit in utero virginis ubique esse. Nam etiam scholastici tradunt, corpus Christi secundum suum esse naturale in uno tantum esse loco, in cœlo; sed secundum suum esse personale nullo contineatur loco, et secundum suum esse sacramentale in multis sit locis, nempe ubique. . . . Cæterum isti nostri non mihi videntur de alio esse corporis Christi quam de esse naturali disputare; alioqui si alii de esse naturali loquantur, alii vero de esse

where? they answer, that locally it is but in one place, but that personally it is everywhere: if they mean," saith he, "that in respect of the being of essence it is finite and confined to one certain place, but that the being of subsistence which it hath is infinite and contained within the straits of no one place, they say the truth, and contradict not them whom they seem to do." Now that this is their meaning, which this worthy learned divine acknowledgeth to be true and catholic, and not contradicted by them that seem to be their opposites, they constantly profess; and therefore I am persuaded that howsoever some of them have used harsh, doubtful, dangerous, and unfitting forms of speech, yet they differ not in meaning and judgment from the orthodox and right believers. For they do not imagine, if we may believe their most constant protestations, any essential or natural communication of divine properties, but personal only; in that the Person of the Son of God is really communicated to the nature of man, in which Person they are: neither do they define the personal union by the communication of properties, but say only that it is implied in it: and touching the co-operation of the two natures of God and man in Christ, they teach no other but that which we described, when we spake of the theandrical actions of Christ. The infinite objections that are made on either side, to the multiplying of needless and fruitless contentions, may easily be cleared, and the seeming contradictions reconciled, by the right understanding of the point about which the difference hath grown.

CHAPTER XVI.

OF THE WORK OF MEDIATION PERFORMED BY CHRIST IN OUR NATURE.

THUS having spoken of the abasing of the Son of God to take our nature, and of the gifts and graces he bestowed on it, when he assumed it into the unity of his Person; it *personali cum scholasticis, aperta est logomaχία.*"—Zanchius, in *Judicio de Coena Dominica*, in fine Miscellan. [Tom. vii. col. 435. Heidelb. 1613.]

remaineth that we speak of the things he did and suffered for us in the same. The thing in general which he did for us in our nature thus assumed, was the mediating between God and us, that he might reconcile us unto God: for the better understanding whereof we must observe what it is to mediate, and the diverse kinds of mediation. Mediation is by all said then to be performed when one interposeth himself between such as are at variance, to reconcile them, or at least between such as have no friendly intercourse, to join them in a league of friendship and amity. The mediation that is between them at variance (the end whereof is reconciliation) is performed four ways. First, by discerning and judging the matters of quarrel and dislike that divide and estrange them one from another. Secondly, by reporting from one of the parties to the other the conditions upon which either of them may come to an agreement with the other; in which sense Moses saith unto the children of Israel, "I was a mediator at that time between God and you¹;" and the apostle saith in the Epistle to the Galatians, "The law was given by angels in the hand of a mediator²." Thirdly, by entreating one party for another: and fourthly, by satisfying one party for the wrongs done by the other. All these ways Christ may be said to have been a Mediator between God and us. For first, he interposed himself as an Arbitrator between God and us, so ordering the matters of difference between us that God should accept our repentance, faith, and purpose of amendment; and that we should not only repent us of the evils past, and prostrate at the feet of his Majesty entreat for mercy, but make a covenant also with ourselves, and bind ourselves by a solemn vow, never to cast his laws behind our back any more. Secondly, he put himself between God and us, by reporting God's pleasure unto us, and what he requireth of us, and by reporting unto God our submissive yielding of ourselves to do that he requireth. Thirdly, he performed the work of a Mediator by entreating the one party to be reconciled to the other, in that "He maketh request for us," as it is in the Epistle to the Romans³; and "is our Advocate," as it is in the Epistle of St John⁴. Lastly, he mediated by satisfying one party for the wrongs

¹ Deut. v. 5.² Gal. iii. 19.³ Rom. viii. 34.⁴ 1 John ii. 1.

done by the other; and this kind of mediation was proper to Christ alone, according to that of the apostle, "He was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him¹." These being the diverse kinds wherein Christ mediateth between God and us, for the better understanding of the nature and force of his mediation two things are to be observed: first, what the nature of medium, that is, a mean between two extremes, is; and secondly, how and according to which nature Christ was a Mediator between God and us.

A medium or mean between two extremes, is of three sorts. The first, when two extremes or contraries concur and meet in a third nature, arising and growing out of the mixture of them both; as white and black, being contrary colours, do meet and concur in the middle colours, and in this sort there can be no mean between God and us. The second, when some qualities or properties of either of the extremes or opposites are found in a third thing; and so Christ as Man was a mean between God and men: for in his human nature was found righteousness, wherein he was like to God; and misery, wherein he was like to men. To which purpose that is that St Augustine hath when he saith², *Christus est Mediator inter Deum et homines. Quid est Deus? Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus. Quid sunt homines? Peccatores, impii, mortales. Inter illam Trinitatem, et hominum infirmitatem, et iniquitatem, Mediator factus est homo, non iniquus, sed tamen infirmus: ut, ex eo quod non iniquus, jungeret te Deo, in eo quod infirmus, propinquaret tibi;* that is, "Christ is a Mediator between God and men; what is God, but the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? What are men but sinners, wicked ones, and subject unto death? Between that Trinity therefore, and the infirmity and iniquity of men, that man became a Mediator that was not sinful but infirm; that in that he was not sinful, he might join thee to God; and in that he was infirm, he might draw near unto thee." The third, when both extremes concur and meet in the same person; and in this sort Christ is most properly a mean, or of a middle condition between God and us, in that both the natures of God and man do concur, and are conjoined in his Person. And to this purpose excellent is that

¹ 2 Cor. v. 21.

² August. in Ps. xxix. [Enarr. 2. § 1. Tom. iv. col. 134.]

of Hugo de S. Victore¹. “The apostle,” saith he, “saith, ‘A mediator is not a mediator of one.’ *Duo enim erant Deus et homo; diversi et adversi: Deus erat justus, homo injustus; in hoc nota adversos: homo erat miser, Deus beatus; in hoc nota diversos. Sic igitur homo et adversus Deo erat, per iniquitatem; et diversus a Deo, per miseriam*: that is, “For God and man were two; diverse and different, adverse and contrary one to the other. God was just, man unjust; in this observe their contrariety: man was miserable, God blessed; in this note their diversity and difference. So therefore man was both adverse and contrary unto God, in respect of iniquity; and diverse and different from God, in respect of misery.” And therefore in this behalf needed a mediator unto God, that he might be reconciled and brought back unto him; but the dispatch of this business of reconciling them that were so greatly at variance no man could conveniently and fitly undertake, who was not nearly conjoined by the bands of friendly society and peaceable agreement with both the parties. For this cause therefore the Son of God became man, that he might be a Mediator of reconciliation and peace between man and God. *Suscepit humanitatem, per quam hominibus appropinquaret; et retinuit Divinitatem, per quam a Deo non recederet: factus homo, sustinuit pœnam, ut demonstraret affectum: servavit justitiam, ut conferret remedium*: that is, “He took unto him the nature of a man, that therein he might draw near unto men; and retained the nature of God, that so he might not depart from God: being made man, he suffered punishment to show his affection; but kept himself just and unworthy of punishment, that he might help and relieve others.” Again, the same Hugo proceedeth and goeth forward, excellently expressing the concurrence of the natures of God and man in the unity of Christ’s person, in this sort: *Verbum quod cum Patre Deo unum erat per ineffabilem unitatem, cum homine assumpto unum factum est per admirabilem unionem: Unitas in natura, Unio in persona: cum Patre Deo Unum in natura, non in Persona: cum homine assumpto Unum in Persona, non in natura. Assumpsit ex nobis nostram naturam, ut eam sibi sociaret per unionem in persona, quæ*

¹ Hugo, Erudit. Theol. de Sacramentis Fidei, Lib. ii. part 1. cap. 12. [Tom. III. p. 440.]

sociata non erat per unitatem in natura : ut per id quod de nostro unum secum fecerat, nos sibi uniret, ut cum ipso unum essemus, per id quod nostrum sibi unitum erat ; et per ipsum unum essemus cum Patre, qui cum ipso unum erat. That is, “The Word which was one with God the Father by ineffable unity, became one with man assumed by admirable union. The unity was in nature ; the union in Person. With God the Father it was one in nature, not in Person ; with man assumed it was one in Person, not in nature. It took of us our nature to join it to itself by union in Person, which had no society with it by unity of nature, that by that which taken from us it made one with itself, it might unite us to itself, that we might be one with it by that of ours which was united to it ; and by it we might be one with the Father, who is one with it.”

Thus having showed in what sort Christ is a mean between the two extremes, God and man, it remaineth that we seek out how and according to which nature he is a mediator. That he is a mediator according to the concurrence of both natures in the unity of his person, it is confessed by all ; for if he were not both God and man he could not mediate between God and men. But whether he be a mediator according to both natures concurring in the work of mediation, there be some that make question. For the clearing whereof the divines distinguish the works of mediation, making them to be of two sorts : of ministry, and of authority. Of ministry, as to pray, to pay the price of redemption, and by dying to satisfy for sin. Of authority, as to pass all good unto us from the Father in the Holy Ghost. Touching the works of ministry, it is agreed on by all, that the person of the Son of God performed them in the nature of man ; for we must distinguish *Principium quod* and *Principium quo* ; that is, the person which doth and suffereth, and that wherein it doth and suffereth such things as are necessary to procure our reconciliation with God. It was the Son of God and Lord of Life that died for us on the cross, but it was the nature of man, not of God, wherein he died ; and it was the nature of God, and infinite excellency of the same, whence the price, value, and worth of his passion grew. The works of authority and power, as to give life, to give the spirit, to raise the dead, to make the blind see, and the dumb to speak, were all per-

formed by the divine nature; yet not without an instrumental concurrence of the nature of man, in sort as hath been before expressed, when I showed how the actions of Christ were divinely-human. If it be alleged that *Opera Trinitatis ad extra* are *indivisa*, that is, that there is nothing that one of the persons of the blessed Trinity doth towards the creatures but they all do it, and, consequently, that those things which Christ did in his divine nature pertained not to the office of a mediator, being common to all the persons; we answer, that as the persons of the blessed Trinity, though they be one and the same God, yet differ *τρόπῳ ὑπάρξεως* in subsistence, and the manner of having and possessing the Deity and divine nature; so though their action be the same, and the work done by them, yet they differ *τρόπῳ πράξεως*, in the manner of doing it: for the Father doth all things authoritative, and the Son subauthoritative, as the schoolmen speak; that is, the Father, as he from whom and of whom all things are; the Son, as he by whom all things are, not as if he were an instrument, but as *principium à principio*, that is, a cause and beginning of things, that hath received the essence it hath, and power of working from another, though the very same that is in the other. And in this sort to quicken, give life, and to impart the spirit of sanctification to whom he pleaseth, especially with a kind of concurring of the human nature, meriting, desiring, and instrumentally assisting, is proper to the Son of God manifested in our flesh, and not common to the whole Trinity; and therefore, notwithstanding the objection taken from the unity of the works of the Divine persons, may be a work of mediation. Bellarmine the Jesuit bringeth many reasons to prove that Christ is not a mediator according to both natures; but that which above all other he most urgeth, is this, "If Christ," saith he, "be a mediator according to both natures, then either according to both, jointly or severally; not severally, because not according to his Divine nature severally considered, being the party offended. Not according to both jointly; because though in that sort he differ from the Father and the Holy Ghost, neither of which is both God and man, and from the sons of men, who are merely men, yet he differeth not from the Son of God, (who was to be pacified by the Mediator, as well as the Father and the Holy Ghost) neither in nature nor

in person¹." This surely is a silly kind of reasoning; for it is not necessary that a thing should differ from both the extremes according to all that in respect whereof it is of a middle condition, but it is sufficient if it differ in some thing from one, and in some thing from another. The middle colour differeth from the extremes, not in the whole nature of it, but from white in that it hath of blackness, and from black in that it hath of whiteness; but it is a medium, in that it hath something of either of them. So the Son of God incarnate differeth not only from the Father and the Holy Ghost, but from himself as God, in that he is man; and from men, and himself as man, in that he is God; and therefore may mediate, not only between the Father and us men, but also between himself, as God, and us miserable and sinful men. Wherefore to conclude this point, we say, that some of the works of Christ the mediator were the works of his humanity, in respect of the thing done, and had their efficacy, dignity, and value from his divinity, in that they were the works of him that had the divinity dwelling bodily in him; and some the works of his divinity, the human nature concurring only instrumentally, as the giving sight to the blind, raising the dead, remitting of sins, and the like. Neither do we imagine one action of both natures, nor say that Christ died, offered himself on the altar of the Cross, or prayed for us in his divinity, as some slanderously report of us; and therefore all the objections that are mustered against us proceeding from the voluntary mistaking of our sense and meaning (which some will not conceive, that they may have something to say against us,) are all easily cleared, and answered by this explication of the same.

By that which hath been said touching Christ's being a mediator according to both natures, we may easily understand how, and according to what nature, he is head of the Church.

¹ "Si Christus est mediator secundum utramque naturam, vel secundum utramque conjunctim sumptas, vel secundum utramque seorsim acceptas; non secundum utramque simul, Christus enim secundum utramque naturam simul sumptam distat quidem a cæteris hominibus, et etiam a Deo Patre, et Spiritu Sancto; at non distat a Deo Filio nec persona nec natura, et tamen etiam ab illo distare debet, cum et ipse sit pars offensa, ad cujus placationem mediatore opus sit."—Bellarm. De Christo Mediatore, Lib. v. cap. 5. [Tom. i. p. 235.]

In a natural head, Bonaventura¹ observeth three things: the first, that it is *Conforme cæteris membris*; the second, that it is *Principium membrorum*; and the third, that it is *Influxivum sensus et motus*; that is, first, that it hath conformity of nature with the rest of the members of the body; secondly, that it is the first, chiefest, and, in a sort, the beginning of all the members; and thirdly, that from it influence of sense and motion doth proceed. And he showeth the same to be found in Christ, the mystical head of the Church. For first, he hath conformity of nature with them that are members of his body, the Church, in that he is man: whereupon St Augustine² saith, *Unius naturæ sunt vitis et palmites*; “the vine and the branches are of the same nature:” and secondly, as the natural head is the chiefest and most principal of all the members, so is Christ more excellent than they that are Christ’s. *Omnia membra faciunt unum corpus*, saith St Augustine³, *multum tamen interest inter caput et cætera membra: etenim in cæteris membris non sentis nisi tactu, tangendo sentis in cæteris membris: in capite autem et vides, et audis, et olfacis, et gustas, et tangis*: “All the members make one body, yet is there great difference between the head and the rest of the members; for in the rest a man hath no sense but that of feeling, in the rest he discerneth by feeling; but in the head he seeth, and heareth, and smelleth, and tasteth, and feeleth.” So in the members of Christ’s mystical body, which is the Church, there are found diversities of gifts, operations, and administrations; and to one is

¹ “In capite materiali hæc tria reperiuntur: scil. quod est membris conforme, est membrorum principium, est etiam influxivum sensus et motus, et propterea in Christo reperiuntur omnes sensus perfectiori modo quam in aliis membris. Omnes autem has proprietates est in Christo reperire respectu bonorum, et ideo valde rationabiliter sancta scriptura dicit Christum esse caput ecclesiæ. Sed prima proprietas, scil. conformitas competit ei ratione humanæ naturæ. . . . Secunda autem proprietas, scil. principiandi competit ratione divinæ naturæ, secundum quod est omnium principium. . . . Tertia vero proprietas, scil. influendi motum et sensum competit ei ratione divinitatis et humanitatis; dupliciter enim convenit sensum et motum gratiæ influere, aut per modum præparantis, aut per modum impartientis.”—Bonaventura in 3 Sent. Dist. xiii. Art. 2. Quæst. 1. [Tom. v. p. 158. Rom. 1596.]

² August. Tract. 80 in cap. 15 Joan. [Tom. III. part. 2. col. 702.]

³ Id. in Psalm. 39. [Lege xxix. Tom. IV. col. 134, g.]

given the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another faith, to another the gift of healing, to another the operation of great works, and to another prophecy; but to the man Christ the Spirit was given without stint or measure, and in him was found the fulness of all grace. The third property of a natural head, which is the influence of sense and motion, agreeth unto Christ in respect of his humanity and divinity both; for he giveth influence of divine sense and motion two ways; *per modum præparantis*, and *per modum impertientis*, that is, by preparing and making men fit to receive grace, and by imparting it to them that are fitted and prepared. He prepareth and fitteth men to the receipt of grace by the acts of his humanity, in which he suffered death, dying satisfied God's wrath, removed all matter of dislike, merited the favour and acceptation of God, and so made men fit to receive the grace of God and to enjoy his favour: he imparteth and conferreth grace by the operation and working of his divine nature, it being the proper work of God to enlighten the understandings of men, and to soften their hearts. So that to conclude this point, we may resolve, that the grace in respect whereof Christ is head of the Church is of two sorts; the one created and habitual, the other increate and of union. In respect of the one, he giveth grace *effective*, by way of efficiency; in respect of the other, *dispositive*, by way of disposition, fitting us, that an impression of grace may be made in us.

CHAPTER XVII.

OF THE THINGS WHICH CHRIST SUFFERED FOR US, TO PROCURE
OUR RECONCILIATION WITH GOD.

HAVING showed how Christ as a Mediator interposed himself between God and us when we were his enemies, and how he is the head of that blessed company of them that believing in him look for salvation; let us see and consider, first, what he suffered for us, to reconcile us unto God: secondly, what he did for us: thirdly, what the benefits are that he bestoweth on us: and fourthly, to whom he com-

mitted the dispensation of the rich treasures of his graces, the word of reconciliation, and the guiding and governing of the people which he purchased as a peculiar inheritance to himself.

Touching the first, to wit the sufferings of Christ, he was by them to satisfy the justice of God his Father displeased with us for sin, that so we might be reconciled unto him. Wherefore, that we may the better conceive what was necessary to be done or suffered to satisfy the justice of God, we must consider sin in the nature of a wrong, and in the nature of sin. In the nature of a wrong; and so two things were required for the pacifying of God's wrath: for first, he that hath done wrong must restore that he unjustly took away from him whom he wronged; and secondly, he must do something in recompense of the wrong he did; as if he took away another man's good name, by false and lying reports, he must not only restore it to him again by acknowledging that the things were untrue which in defamation of him he had spoken, but he must also take all occasions to raise, continue, and increase a good opinion of him. If sin be considered in the nature of sin it implieth in it two things: *debitum pœnæ*, and *debitum neglectæ obedientiæ*, that is, a debt of punishment, and a debt of obedience then neglected, when it should have been performed; and therefore in the satisfaction that is to reconcile us to God displeased with us for sin as sin, two things must be implied: for first, the punishment must be sustained that sin deserved; and secondly, that obedience must be performed that should have been yielded whilst sin was committed, but was neglected. For if only the punishment be sustained we may escape the condemnation of death, but we cannot inherit eternal life, unless the righteousness and obedience which God's law requireth be found in us also. Now the law of God requireth obedience, not only in the present time, and time to come, but from the beginning of our life to the end of the same, if we desire to inherit the promised blessedness. And though the performance of that obedience that was neglected may seem to be in the nature of merit rather than satisfaction; yet in that it is not simply the meriting and procuring of favour and acceptation, but the recovering of lost friendship, and the regaining of renewed love, it is rightly esteemed to pertain unto satisfaction.

Touching sin considered in the nature of an offence and wrong, and the things required to pacify God's wrath in that respect, there is no question but that the sinner himself that wronged God in sinning, must by sorrow of heart, disliking and detesting, and by confession of mouth, condemning former evils, restore that glory to God he took from him; and seek and take all occasions the weakness of his means will afford, to glorify God as much as he dishonoured him before: and God accepteth weak endeavours as sufficient in this kind, Christ having perfectly satisfied for us; as a public person may accept of a mean and weak satisfaction for the wrong done to him, but must inflict punishment answerable to the fault, to satisfy public justice offended by that wrong. Wherefore, passing from this kind of satisfaction, let us speak of that other that God requireth, standing in the suffering of punishments due to sin. Some define this kind of satisfaction to be the suffering of the punishments that God inflicteth, or wherewith a man voluntarily punisheth himself: but this is not a good definition. For as a thief or murderer may not lay violent hands on himself, and be his own executioner when he hath offended, to satisfy public justice, but must submit himself to that which authority will lay on him; so it is so far from being any satisfaction to God's justice, for a man when he hath sinned, to become his own executioner, and to punish himself for his sin to satisfy the justice of God, that it highly displeaseth God. It is true indeed, that we may lawfully afflict ourselves, not to satisfy God's justice, but to purge out the dross of that sinful impurity that cleaveth to us, and to cure the wounds of our souls, as we may afflict ourselves by fasting, watching, and abstaining from many things otherwise lawful, for the freeing of ourselves from the remains of our former excessive and immoderate delight in eating, drinking, surfeiting, and riot, and other abuses of the good creatures of God. So that we must not define satisfaction to be the suffering of those punishments that God inflicteth, or wherewith the sinner punisheth himself; for it is only the sustaining of those that God in justice doth inflict. And in this sort Christ satisfied his Father's wrath, not by punishing himself, but by being obedient to his Father even unto the death. Wherefore let us proceed more particularly to consider the satisfactory sufferings of Christ, and see first,

what punishments Christ suffered to pacify his Father's wrath; and secondly, what the manner of his passion was.

Touching the punishments that Christ suffered, they were not ordinary, but beyond measure, grievous, bitter, and insupportable: yea, such as would have made any mere creature to sink down under the burthen of them to the bottom of hell. For he suffered grievous things from all the things in heaven, earth, and hell, and in all that any way pertained to him. He suffered at the hands of God his Father, and of men; of Jews, of Gentiles, of enemies insulting, of friends forsaking, of the prince of darkness, and all his cruel and merciless instruments; of the elements of the world, the sun denying to give him light, the air breath, and the earth supportance. He suffered in all that pertained to him; in his name, being condemned as a blasphemer, as an enemy to Moses, the law, the temple, and worship of God; to his own nation, to Cæsar, and the Romans; a glutton, a companion with publicans and sinners, a Samaritan, one that had a devil, and did all his miracles by the power of Beelzebub. In the things he possessed, when they stripped him out of his garments, and cast lots on his seamless coat. In his friends greatly distressed and discomfited with the sight of those things that fell out unto him, according to that which was prophesied before: "The shepherd shall be smitten, and the sheep shall be scattered¹." In his body, when his hands and feet were nailed, his sides gored, his head pierced with the crown of thorns, his cheeks swollen with buffeting, his face defiled with spitting upon, his eyes offended with beholding the scornful behaviour of his proud insulting enemies, his ears with hearing the words of their execrable blasphemy, his taste with the myrrh and gall that they gave him in his drink, his smell with the stench and horror of the place wherein he was crucified, being a place of dead men's skulls. Lastly, in his soul distressed with fears, and compassed about with sorrows besetting him on every side, and that even unto death. In so woful a sort did he take on him our defects, and suffer our punishments.

But, because we may as well enlarge and amplify Christ's passions and sufferings too much, as extenuate them too much, let us see, if it be possible, the utmost extent of that he suf-

¹ Mark xiv. 27.

had been born they should have had the use of reason, so far forth as to discern outward things good or evil (seeing even the little lambs by nature's instinct do know the wolf, and fly from him, and seek the dugs of their dams), but not to discern things concerning moral virtue and the worship of God. So likewise some think that the babe Jesus, even in his human soul, had the actual knowledge of all things even from the beginning, and that he grew only in experimental knowledge: but there are other, of as good judgment and as great learning, who think that howsoever he had the habit of all knowledge from the beginning, and brought it with him out of the womb, yet not the act and use of it: and this is all that either Luther or Calvin say; and yet we know how clamorously some inveigh against them, as if they had broached some damnable heresy. But some man will say, "If we grant that Christ in his human soul knew not all things from the beginning, but in process of time learned that which before he actually knew not, we fasten on him the disgraceful note of ignorance, and consequently bring him within the confines and compass of sin." Hereunto Hugo de S. Victore¹ answereth, and sheweth the folly of this silly objection, peremptorily resolving, that *non omnis qui aliquid nescit, aut minus perfecte scit, statim ignorantiam habere, seu in ignorantia esse dicendus est; quia ignorantia non dicitur, nisi tunc solum, cum id quod ignorari non debuisset nescitur*: that is, "we must not say that every one that knoweth not a thing, or doth less perfectly know it, is ignorant, or in ignorance; because ignorance is only the not knowing of such things as should have been known. Neither is there any distinction more trivial or ordinary in the schools than that of nescience and ignorance; and therefore howsoever some in the heat of their distempered passions lay a heavy imputation of horrible impiety upon Luther, Calvin, and others, for that they say there were some things which Christ in his human soul did not actually know from the beginning; yet Maldonatus², a man as ill con-

¹ Hugo de Sancto Victore, De Sacram. Fid. Lib. i. part vi. cap. 26. [Tom. III. p. 538.]

² "Objiciebant Ariani Deum non esse, qui spiritu sapientiaque profecisset. Respondebant varie catholici, quidam profecisse quidem vere, sed humana non divina sapientia, et profecisse ut hominem non ut Deum. Libenter hanc sententiam omnes hæretici novi, Lutherani

ceited of them as any other, confesseth that though some say Christ profited in wisdom and knowledge, not in his own person, but in his mystical body which is the Church; others, that his growing and increasing was only in the manifestation of that which in all perfection was found in him from the beginning, or in experimental knowledge of those things which in general contemplation he knew before; yet many of the ancient fathers, answering the objections of the Arians and other like heretics, and rejecting as impious their conceit who thought Christ was absolutely ignorant of any thing, denied not but that there were some things which Christ in his human nature did not actually always know. "This," saith Maldonat, "I suppose Luther, Calvin, and the rest knew not; for had they known that the fathers taught that Christ did truly grow in human knowledge and wisdom, and that he knew not all things actually from the beginning, to be contrary to the fathers, they would have been of another mind." How charitable this his surmise and conjecture is, let the reader judge. Howsoever we have his clear confession, that many of the fathers were of opinion, that Christ in his human nature did not always actually know all things: yea, upon the xxivth of Matthew he testifieth, that many of them said plainly¹ that Christ as man knew not the day appointed for

et Calviniani amplexi sunt. Magis ferendum si eorum quos nominavimus patrum auctoritate commoti fecissent; sed ut puto nesciebant eam aliquorum patrum fuisse sententiam, non secuturi fortasse si scivissent. . . . Hoc aliquorum veterum auctorum responsio non immerito est a posterioribus repudiata. Et vero illi ipsi qui ejus fuerunt auctores, Athan. et Cyrillus quasi ea non satis fidentes alias adhibuerunt. Non vero in se profecisse sed in nobis, quia ut nos spiritu sapientia et gratia proficeremus effecit, itaque non de propria Christi persona sed de persona corporis ejus quod est ecclesia, ut multa alia, id esse dictum. Item quod rem magis continet, non vere ac re ipsa, sed demonstratione, ostensioneque, et hominum opinione profecisse, quod illi quos diximus, et alii omnes veteres recentioresque auctores docuerunt."—Maldonat. in Luc. ii. 40. [col. 123. Mogunt. 1596.]

¹ "Gravius hoc loco catholicis cum Arianis quæstio fuit dum hinc Ariani Christi divinitatem refutare conarentur, quod Christus diem judicii diceretur ignorare. Nonnulli veteres auctores testimonii difficultate pressi eo confugerunt, ut locum vitiatum esse dicerent, nec legendum esse, 'neque filius, nisi pater.' Alii Christum ignorasse quidem diem judicii quamdiu in hac vita fuit, scivisse vero simul atque ad patrem ascendisset. Sic Origenes, Tract. 30 in Matth., cum hæc

the general judgment of the quick and dead, when he said, "That day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels, nor the Son himself, but the Father only." It is true indeed that he goeth about, notwithstanding this his clear confession of the truth, to construe the words of some of the fathers in such sort, as if they had not meant simply, that Christ in his human soul knew not that hour and time, but only that he knew it not by force of his human nature; but this commentary (I fear) will not agree with their texts: for Origen in his third tract upon Matthew saith, that Christ knew not the time and day of judgment, when he said, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the Son;" but that afterwards he knew it, when he was risen, and appointed of his Father king and judge: which words of his admit no such gloss. Wherefore Jansenius¹ saith, there are two principal interpretations of those words of Christ, when he saith, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the Son;" the

Christus dicebat, eum diem judicii ignorasse scribit, post resurrectionem vero scivisse, quod tunc rex, et judex a Patre constitutus sit. . . . Multi veteres et graves auctores aperte docuerunt, Christum quatenus hominem diem judicii ignoravisse. Quod etsi auditione prima horrendum videtur esse, adhibita tamen interpretatione verum habere potest sensum.—Id in Matth. xxiv. 36. [col. 495.]

¹ "Inter varios modos quibus varie ostenditur quomodo illud accipi possit, duo sunt præcipui. Alter ut dicatur filium dictum ignorare quatenus erat homo. Quod tamen rursum dupliciter intelligi potest. Nam si quidem, ut habet communis sententia, Christus ab initio suæ conceptionis per infusam scientiam omnium habuit cognitionem, ut intelligitur profecisse sapientia, solum ob id quia sapientiæ majorem cum ætatis accessu edidit demonstrationem; jam Christus, quatenus homo intelligendus est ignorare diem judicii, cognitione et scientia naturali aut scientia acquisita. Si autem intelligatur Christus quatenus homo vere profecisse sapientia, sicut vere profecit ætate, nec omnium cognitionem mox ab initio illi fuisse infusam, jam etiam videtur intelligi posse Christum quatenus homo necdum cognovisse absolute diem judicii, cum hæc diceret, quamvis post resurrectionem et ascensionem jam cognoscat. Hoc modo num præsens locus intelligi possit, expendendum inter varios quos affert sensus, relinquit Origenes. Certe Cyrillus libro nono Thesauri, capite 4, fatetur Christum de se quatenus homo erat, dixisse quod ignoraret diem judicii, quod proprium sit humanæ naturæ ignorare futura.

"Alter modus explicandi, et quidem melius, hunc locum est, ut intelligatur Christum dicere se ignorare illum diem et horam, quod non sic eum a Patre didicisset et accepisset, ut hominibus illum aperire et

one, that he said he knew it not, because he knew it not to reveal it, and because his body the Church knew it not; the other, that he knew it not as man: and this interpretation he showeth to be likewise two-fold: for, saith he, if we follow the common opinion that Christ had the perfect knowledge of all things in his human soul at the first, then we must understand that Christ said he knew not the day of judgment, because he knew it not by natural and acquiste knowledge, but by virtue of that knowledge that was infused into him; but if we follow the other opinion, that Christ had not perfect knowledge of all things in his human soul at the first, but grew in it, then, as Origen among other senses delivereth, the meaning of the words is, that he knew it not till after his resurrection.

And surely Cyril¹, a worthy bishop, and one that had many conflicts with the Nestorian heretics who divided the person of Christ, feareth not directly to say, that Christ as man knew not the day appointed for the general judgment, when he used the words before mentioned. Neither is this the heresy of the Agnoetæ, as some ignorantly affirm: for their error was, that the Deity of Christ was ignorant of some thing, or that Christ in his human nature was properly ignorant, that is, knew not such things, and at such time, as he should have known; and that he is still ignorant of sundry things in the state of his glorification; as it appeareth by that Epistle of Gregory², in which one of them allegeth, that as

indicare deberet, quem præcognoscere hominibus non expediebat, ut semper incerti de adventu judicis, sic vivant quotidie, quasi die alio sint judicandi.—Jansenius, Comment. in suam Concordiam Evangelicam, cap. 123. [p. 109. Mogunt. 1612.]

¹ “Εἰ δὲ τόπον οἰκονομίας εἰσάγεσθαι τίνα διὰ τοῦτο δώσετε, μὴ ξενί-
ζεσθε, καὶ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, δι’ οὗ καὶ τότε τὴν ἐρώτησιν πρὸς τε Ἀδὰμ
καὶ τὸν Κάϊν ἐποιεῖτο Θεὸς, οἰκονομῶν τι χρήσιμον μὴ εἰδέναι λέγει τὴν ἡμέ-
ραν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, καίτοι πάντα εἰδὼς ὡς σοφία τοῦ Πατρός.”—Cyril. Alex.
Thesaur. [Assert. 32. Tom. v. part 1. p. 223. Lut. 1638.]

² “Ad hoc vero mihi idem communis filius Anatolius diaconus respondit aliam quæstionem, dicens, Quid si obijciatur mihi, quia sicut immortalis mori dignatus est ut nos liberaret a morte, et æternus ante tempora fieri voluit temporalis, ita Dei sapientia ignorantiam nostram suscipere dignata est, ut nos ab ignorantia liberaret.”—Greg. Epist. Lib. viii. Ep. 42. [Al. Lib. x. Ep. 39. Tom. ii. col. 1071. Par. 1705.]

“Οἱ γοῦν ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ Ἀκεφάλου Σεβήρου, οὐ μόνον Ἀγνοῆται, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σεβηρίται ἔσχον ἐπὶ κλήσιν· οἱ καὶ λέγουσι τὸν Θεὸν λόγον πάντα μὲν

Christ took our nature, so he took our ignorance, to free us from the same : and therefore Maldonatus¹ upon the xxivth of Matthew saith, that the Themistians, called also Agnoetæ, were accounted heretics, not for saying Christ knew not the day of judgment, as *Damascene de hæresibus*² testifieth ; but that, as may be gathered out of the same Damascene, they simply, without all distinction of the divine or human nature, said Christ was ignorant thereof, because they thought the divinity was turned into the humanity.

CHAPTER XV.

OF THE THIRD KIND OF COMMUNICATION OF PROPERTIES, AND
THE SECOND DEGREE THEREOF.

THUS having spoken of those finite and created things that were bestowed on the nature of man when it was assumed into the unity of the divine person, let us come to those things that are infinite. Where first we are certainly to resolve, that as the nature of man was truly given and communicated to the Person of the Son of God, so that he is indeed and really Man ; so the Person of the Son of God was as truly communicated to the nature of man, that it might subsist in it, and that that which was fashioned in the womb

γινώσκειν, πάμπολλα δὲ ἀγνοεῖν, τὴν ἐνωμένην αὐτῷ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἀνθρωπότητα· ἔτι γε μὴν ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν τῆς παγκοσμίου συντελείας, οἷα ἐλάττονα τοῦ Πατρὸς.”—Niceph. Hist. Eccles. Lib. xviii. cap. 50. Tom. II. p. 878. Lut. Par. 1630.]

¹ “Habiti sunt Themistiani cognomento Agnoetæ pro hæreticis, quod docuerint Christum diem judicii ignorasse, ut Damascenus in libro de hæresibus auctor est. Verum illi, ut ex eodem Damasceno colligitur, simpliciter, et sine ulla distinctione divinæ humanæque naturæ ignorantiam Christo tribuebant, quia credebant divinitatem in humanitatem fuisse conversam.”—Maldonat. in Matt. xxiv. 36. [col. 516. Lugd. 1598.]

² “Ἀγνοῖται, οἱ καὶ Θεμιστιανοί· οἱ ἀγνοεῖν ἀσεβῶς καταγγέλλοντες τὸν Χριστὸν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς κρίσεως, καὶ δειλίαν αὐτοῦ καταγράφοντες· Οὗτοι δὲ ἀπόσχισμα τῶν Θεοδοσιανῶν εἰσὶν· ὁ γὰρ Θεμιστίος ὃς ἐγένετο αὐτῶν αἵρεσιάρχης μίαν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ φύσιν σύνθετον ἐπρέσβευεν.”—Joann. Damascen. de Hæres. [§ 85, Tom. I. p. 107. Par. 1712.]

of the blessed virgin, and born of her, might not only be holy, but the holiest of all, even the Son of God. Secondly, that in this sense the fulness of all perfection, and all the properties of the divine essence, are communicated to the nature of man in the Person of the Son: for as the Father communicated his essence to the Son by eternal generation, who therefore is the second Person in Trinity, and God of God; so in the Person of the Son he really communicated the same to the nature of man formed in Mary's womb, in such sort that that Man that was born of her is truly God. And in this sense the German divines affirm that there is a real communication of the divine properties to the nature of man, in the personal union of the natures of God and Man in Christ; not by physical communication, or effusion, as if the like and equal properties to those that are in God were put inherently into the nature of man, in such sort as the heat transfused from the fire into the water is inherent in it, (whence would follow a confusion, conversion, and equalling of the natures, and natural properties) but personal, in the Person of the Son of God: for as the Person of the Son of God, in whom the nature and essence of God is found, is so communicated to the nature of Man, that the Man Christ is not only in phrase of speech named God, but is indeed and really God; so he is as really omnipotent, having all power both in heaven and earth. "There is one Christ," saith Luther¹, "who is both the Son of God and of the virgin. By the right of his first birth, not in time but from all eternity, he received

¹ "Idem est et unus Christus, Dei et virginis Filius. Sed is ex illa priore nativitate, non in tempore, sed ab æterno a Deo Patre accepit illam æternam potentiam, hoc est, ipsam divinitatem, et hanc ei æternus Pater omnem et integram ab æterno tradidit, ita ut eam ipse æternam habet. . . . Quod attinet ad alteram in tempore coeptam humanam naturam Christi, sic quoque data est ei æterna potentia Dei, sed ut dixi, non ab æterno, vel ante initium temporis. Cæterum ab eo ipso momento temporis, cum divina natura conjuncta et unita est humana in unam personam, ab eo inquam articulo, hic virginis filius vere est et dicitur Deus æternus. 'Mihi,' inquit. . . . 'Etsi enim ab æterno mea est hæc potestas, antequam humanam naturam assumpsi, tamen postquam homo esse cœpi jam etiam secundum humanam naturam eandem potestatem in tempore accepi, sed etiam nondum quidem palam ostendi hoc meo tempore infirmitatis et crucis.'"—Luther. De novissimis verbis Davidis, Tom. III. fol. 91. [Witteberg. 1583.]

all power, that is, the Deity itself, which the Father communicated to him eternally: but touching the other nature of Christ, which began in time, even so also the eternal power of God was given unto him; so that the Son of the Virgin is truly and really eternal God, having eternal power, according to that in the last of Matthew¹, 'All power is given unto me both in heaven and in earth.' And of this power a little after he bringeth in Christ speaking in this sort: 'Although this power was mine eternally, before I assumed the nature of man, notwithstanding after I began to be man, even according to the nature of man I received the same power in time, though I shewed it not during the time of my infirmity and cross.'" Bonaventura² saith the very same in effect that Luther doth: "When it is said," saith he, "speaking of the Man Christ, 'This man is everywhere,' this may either note out the Person of Christ, or the singular and individual nature of a man: if the Person of Christ, there is no doubt but the proposition is true; if the individual nature of a man, yet still it is true, not by propriety of nature, but by communication of properties; because that which agreeth to the Son of God by nature, agreeth unto this Man by grace." Cardinal Cameracensis³ agreeth with Bonaventura, affirming, that the divine attributes and properties are more really communicated to the Man Christ, than the human are to the Son

¹ Matth. xxviii. 18.

² "Cum dicitur, 'Iste homo est ubique,' hoc pronomen *iste* potest demonstrare personam Christi vel singulare hominis. Si personam Christi, sic absque dubio ista vera est, 'Iste homo est ubique.' Si vero singulare hominis, adhuc vera est: sed non per propriam naturam sed per communicationem idiomatum, quia quod convenit Filio Dei per naturam convenit isti homini per gratiam."—Bonaventura, in 3 Sent. Dist. xxii. Qu. 2. [Tom. v. p. 260. Rom. 1596.]

³ "Itaque est verum dicere quod 'Hic homo est Filius Dei, æternus, immensus, creator mundi, &c.' et etiam e converso ea quæ dicuntur de natura assumpta in concreto sub hoc nomine *homo* verificantur de Christo sub hoc nomine *Deus*. . . . Sed dico quod non consimiliter seu æque proprie dicuntur prædicata divina de hoc homine et humana prædicata de Deo: eo quod in Christo persona divina est assumens et natura humana assumpta. Unde magis proprie de Christo dicitur, 'Iste homo est immortalis,' absque hoc quod addatur, secundum divinitatem, quoniam iste homo est proprie persona divina, quam dicatur, 'Deus est mortalis.'"—Petrus ab Alliaco Cameracensis, in 3 Sent. Quæst. 1. [Art. 1. fol. 206, B. Par. sin. ann.]

of God: and that therefore a man may most truly and properly say, speaking of the Man Christ, This Man is immortal, almighty, and of infinite power and majesty; because he is properly the divine Person, and so consequently truly and really immortal and omnipotent. Yea, Bellarmine¹, though he impugn the errors of the Lutherans (as he calleth them) with all bitterness, yet confesseth all that hitherto hath been said to be most true. “I say,” saith he, “as before, that the glory of God the Father was given to the humanity of Christ, *non in ipsa*, not to be formally or subjectively inherent in it, but in the divine Person; that is, that by grace of union the human nature of Christ obtained to be in such sort the nature of the Son of God, that the Man Christ should be truly and really in the glory of God the Father, filling both heaven and earth.” Again he saith, “Those places, ‘All things are given me of my Father²,’ and, ‘All power is given me both in heaven and earth³,’ may be understood, first, of divine power which the Son of God received of the Father by eternal generation; and secondly, of divine power, which the nature of man received by personal union.” And in another place, speaking of sundry things proper to God, he saith: “All those things may be said to be communicated and given to the human nature, not formally in itself, but in the Person of the Son of God by the grace of union⁴.”

¹ “Respondeo, ut supra, datam esse gloriam Dei Patris humanitati Christi, non in ipsa, sed in supposito; id est, per gratiam unionis accepisse Christi humanitatem, ut esset natura Filii Dei, et proinde illum hominem Christum esse in gloria Patris, et terram pugillo continere, et cœlum et terram implere.

“Tertium argumentum, Matt. xi. ‘Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo.’ Et Matt. ult. ‘Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo et in terra.’ Quo loco omnis potestas notat omnipotentiam in cœlo et in terra: omnipræsentiam, proinde Christus vere præsens omnia gubernat. Respondeo, priora duo loca posse intelligi dupliciter. Primo, de potentia divina quam accepit Filius Dei per æternam generationem, et tunc non sunt hæc loca ad propositum. Secundo, de potentia divina quam accepit natura humana per unionem hypostaticam, et tunc eadem est responsio quæ ad superiora argumenta.”—Bellarm. De Incarnatione, Lib. iii. cap. 16. [Tom. i. p. 207.]

² Matt. xi. 27.

³ Matt. xxviii. 18.

⁴ “Ex unione hypostatica sequitur communicatio idiomatum, quæ quidem communicatio non est realis respectu ipsarum naturarum, . . . sed ex respectu hypostasis utriusque naturæ.”—Id. [cap. 9. p. 200.]

The divines distinguish the properties of God, and make them to be of two sorts, communicable and incommunicable. Communicable properties they define to be those perfections that are called *perfectiones simpliciter*, which are found without mixture of imperfection in God, and in a more imperfect sort in the creatures. These they name *perfectiones simpliciter*, that is, simply and absolutely perfections, because it is better for anything to have them, than not to have them; and because those things are better that have them, than those that have them not: as likewise, for that they imply in them no imperfection, though they be mingled with imperfection and defect in the creatures. Of this sort is life, which it is better to have than not to have; and it includeth in it no imperfection, though it be accompanied with defect and imperfection in many of the things wherein it is found: for that life that is in trees is an imperfect life; and the life of men, who in truth then begin to die when they begin to live, is imperfect; yea, the life of angels is imperfect, because if they be not continually sustained, they return to that nothing out of which they were made. Of the same kind are truth, goodness, justice, mercy, wisdom, knowledge, and understanding: and therefore all these, separated from that imperfection that cleaveth unto them elsewhere, are found in God, and may truly be attributed unto him. Incommunicable properties are nothing else but the negation and removing of all that imperfection that is in the creatures, of which sort are immortality, eternity, immensity, infinity, and the like, all importing a negation of imperfection. The former of these two sorts of divine properties which are named communicable, are communicated to mere creatures in some degree and sort, though in highest degree they are no where found but in God; and with the addition of words expressing such eminency they may be attributed to none but to God; for he only is Almighty, most wise, most just, and most merciful: but both these with addition of highest degree, and the other which are named incommunicable, are by all divines confessed to be in such sort communicated in the Person of the Son of God to the nature of man assumed into the unity of the same, that the Man Christ, and the Son of Mary, is not in title only, but really and indeed, most wise, most just, omnipotent, incomprehensible, eternal, and infinite.

And this is all, as I think, that the divines of Germany the followers of Luther mean, when they speak of the real communication of divine properties to the human nature in Christ. If any man say, that they may justly be thought to proceed farther, and to understand some other communication of properties than that by us expressed, in that they do not only say concretively, that the Man Christ is omnipresent, but the humanity also; it may be answered, that when we speak of the humanity of Christ, sometimes we understand only that human created essence of a man that was in him, sometimes all that that is implied in the being of a man, as well subsistence as essence. In the former sort, it is absurd and impious to think that the humanity of Christ, that is, the created essence of a man in him, is omnipotent, omnipresent, or infinite; neither do they so think; but they affirm that the subsistence of the Man Christ implied in his being a Man is infinite and omnipresent, as being the subsistence of the Son of God communicated to the nature of Man, instead of that finite subsistence, which, left to itself, it would have had of its own.

Much contention there hath been between them and other touching the ubiquitary presence of the humanity of Christ; but I verily think it hath been in a great part upon mistaking, and because they understood not one another: for the followers of Luther confess that the body of Christ is only in one place locally, and do not think it to be everywhere in extent of essence diffused into all places, but say only that it is everywhere in the infiniteness of the subsistence of the Son of God communicated to it. "If we ask them," saith Zanchius¹, "whether Christ's body be every-

¹ "Intelligo quidem communicatione *ιδιωμάτων*, sicut recte dicitur Christum Deum passum et mortuum esse, ita etiam orthodoxe dici, Christum hominem, i. e. illam personam quæ non solum Deus est sed etiam homo, ubique esse. At corpus Christi quod una tantum pars est humanæ naturæ in Christo sua substantia, i. e. secundum esse (ut loquuntur scholastici) naturale quod accepit in utero virginis ubique esse. Nam etiam scholastici tradunt, corpus Christi secundum suum esse naturale in uno tantum esse loco, in cœlo; sed secundum suum esse personale nullo contineatur loco, et secundum suum esse sacramentale in multis sit locis, nempe ubique. . . . Cæterum isti nostri non mihi videntur de alio esse corporis Christi quam de esse naturali disputare; alioqui si alii de esse naturali loquantur, alii vero de esse

where? they answer, that locally it is but in one place, but that personally it is everywhere: if they mean," saith he, "that in respect of the being of essence it is finite and confined to one certain place, but that the being of subsistence which it hath is infinite and contained within the straits of no one place, they say the truth, and contradict not them whom they seem to do." Now that this is their meaning, which this worthy learned divine acknowledgeth to be true and catholic, and not contradicted by them that seem to be their opposites, they constantly profess; and therefore I am persuaded that howsoever some of them have used harsh, doubtful, dangerous, and unfitting forms of speech, yet they differ not in meaning and judgment from the orthodox and right believers. For they do not imagine, if we may believe their most constant protestations, any essential or natural communication of divine properties, but personal only; in that the Person of the Son of God is really communicated to the nature of man, in which Person they are: neither do they define the personal union by the communication of properties, but say only that it is implied in it: and touching the co-operation of the two natures of God and man in Christ, they teach no other but that which we described, when we spake of the theandrical actions of Christ. The infinite objections that are made on either side, to the multiplying of needless and fruitless contentions, may easily be cleared, and the seeming contradictions reconciled, by the right understanding of the point about which the difference hath grown.

CHAPTER XVI.

OF THE WORK OF MEDIATION PERFORMED BY CHRIST IN OUR NATURE.

THUS having spoken of the abasing of the Son of God to take our nature, and of the gifts and graces he bestowed on it, when he assumed it into the unity of his Person; it

personali cum scholasticis, aperta est λογوماχία."—Zanchius, in *Judicio de Cœna Dominica*, in fine *Miscellan.* [Tom. vii. col. 435. Heidelb. 1613.]

remaineth that we speak of the things he did and suffered for us in the same. The thing in general which he did for us in our nature thus assumed, was the mediating between God and us, that he might reconcile us unto God: for the better understanding whereof we must observe what it is to mediate, and the diverse kinds of mediation. Mediation is by all said then to be performed when one interposeth himself between such as are at variance, to reconcile them, or at least between such as have no friendly intercourse, to join them in a league of friendship and amity. The mediation that is between them at variance (the end whereof is reconciliation) is performed four ways. First, by discerning and judging the matters of quarrel and dislike that divide and estrange them one from another. Secondly, by reporting from one of the parties to the other the conditions upon which either of them may come to an agreement with the other; in which sense Moses saith unto the children of Israel, "I was a mediator at that time between God and you¹;" and the apostle saith in the Epistle to the Galatians, "The law was given by angels in the hand of a mediator²." Thirdly, by entreating one party for another: and fourthly, by satisfying one party for the wrongs done by the other. All these ways Christ may be said to have been a Mediator between God and us. For first, he interposed himself as an Arbitrator between God and us, so ordering the matters of difference between us that God should accept our repentance, faith, and purpose of amendment; and that we should not only repent us of the evils past, and prostrate at the feet of his Majesty entreat for mercy, but make a covenant also with ourselves, and bind ourselves by a solemn vow, never to cast his laws behind our back any more. Secondly, he put himself between God and us, by reporting God's pleasure unto us, and what he requireth of us, and by reporting unto God our submissive yielding of ourselves to do that he requireth. Thirdly, he performed the work of a Mediator by entreating the one party to be reconciled to the other, in that "He maketh request for us," as it is in the Epistle to the Romans³; and "is our Advocate," as it is in the Epistle of St John⁴. Lastly, he mediated by satisfying one party for the wrongs

¹ Deut. v. 5.² Gal. iii. 19.³ Rom. viii. 34.⁴ 1 John ii. 1.

done by the other; and this kind of mediation was proper to Christ alone, according to that of the apostle, "He was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him¹." These being the diverse kinds wherein Christ mediateth between God and us, for the better understanding of the nature and force of his mediation two things are to be observed: first, what the nature of medium, that is, a mean between two extremes, is; and secondly, how and according to which nature Christ was a Mediator between God and us.

A medium or mean between two extremes, is of three sorts. The first, when two extremes or contraries concur and meet in a third nature, arising and growing out of the mixture of them both; as white and black, being contrary colours, do meet and concur in the middle colours, and in this sort there can be no mean between God and us. The second, when some qualities or properties of either of the extremes or opposites are found in a third thing; and so Christ as Man was a mean between God and men: for in his human nature was found righteousness, wherein he was like to God; and misery, wherein he was like to men. To which purpose that is that St Augustine hath when he saith², *Christus est Mediator inter Deum et homines. Quid est Deus? Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus. Quid sunt homines? Peccatores, impii, mortales. Inter illam Trinitatem, et hominum infirmitatem, et iniquitatem, Mediator factus est homo, non iniquus, sed tamen infirmus: ut, ex eo quod non iniquus, jungeret te Deo, in eo quod infirmus, propinquaret tibi;* that is, "Christ is a Mediator between God and men; what is God, but the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? What are men but sinners, wicked ones, and subject unto death? Between that Trinity therefore, and the infirmity and iniquity of men, that man became a Mediator that was not sinful but infirm; that in that he was not sinful, he might join thee to God; and in that he was infirm, he might draw near unto thee." The third, when both extremes concur and meet in the same person; and in this sort Christ is most properly a mean, or of a middle condition between God and us, in that both the natures of God and man do concur, and are conjoined in his Person. And to this purpose excellent is that

¹ 2 Cor. v. 21.

² August. in Ps. xxix. [Enarr. 2. § 1. Tom. iv. col. 134.]

of Hugo de S. Victore¹. “The apostle,” saith he, “saith, ‘A mediator is not a mediator of one.’ *Duo enim erant Deus et homo; diversi et adversi: Deus erat justus, homo injustus; in hoc nota adversos: homo erat miser, Deus beatus; in hoc nota diversos. Sic igitur homo et adversus Deo erat, per iniquitatem; et diversus a Deo, per miseriam*: that is, “For God and man were two; diverse and different, adverse and contrary one to the other. God was just, man unjust; in this observe their contrariety: man was miserable, God blessed; in this note their diversity and difference. So therefore man was both adverse and contrary unto God, in respect of iniquity; and diverse and different from God, in respect of misery.” And therefore in this behalf needed a mediator unto God, that he might be reconciled and brought back unto him; but the dispatch of this business of reconciling them that were so greatly at variance no man could conveniently and fitly undertake, who was not nearly conjoined by the bands of friendly society and peaceable agreement with both the parties. For this cause therefore the Son of God became man, that he might be a Mediator of reconciliation and peace between man and God. *Suscepit humanitatem, per quam hominibus appropinquaret; et retinuit Divinitatem, per quam a Deo non recederet: factus homo, sustinuit pœnam, ut demonstraret affectum: servavit justitiam, ut conferret remedium*: that is, “He took unto him the nature of a man, that therein he might draw near unto men; and retained the nature of God, that so he might not depart from God: being made man, he suffered punishment to show his affection; but kept himself just and unworthy of punishment, that he might help and relieve others.” Again, the same Hugo proceedeth and goeth forward, excellently expressing the concurrence of the natures of God and man in the unity of Christ’s person, in this sort: *Verbum quod cum Patre Deo unum erat per ineffabilem unitatem, cum homine assumpto unum factum est per admirabilem unionem: Unitas in natura, Unio in persona: cum Patre Deo Unum in natura, non in Persona: cum homine assumpto Unum in Persona, non in natura. Assumpsit ex nobis nostram naturam, ut eam sibi sociaret per unionem in persona, quæ*

¹ Hugo, Erudit. Theol. de Sacramentis Fidei, Lib. ii. part 1. cap. 12. [Tom. III. p. 440.]

sociata non erat per unitatem in natura : ut per id quod de nostro unum secum fecerat, nos sibi uniret, ut cum ipso unum essemus, per id quod nostrum sibi unitum erat ; et per ipsum unum essemus cum Patre, qui cum ipso unum erat. That is, "The Word which was one with God the Father by ineffable unity, became one with man assumed by admirable union. The unity was in nature ; the union in Person. With God the Father it was one in nature, not in Person ; with man assumed it was one in Person, not in nature. It took of us our nature to join it to itself by union in Person, which had no society with it by unity of nature, that by that which taken from us it made one with itself, it might unite us to itself, that we might be one with it by that of ours which was united to it ; and by it we might be one with the Father, who is one with it."

Thus having showed in what sort Christ is a mean between the two extremes, God and man, it remaineth that we seek out how and according to which nature he is a mediator. That he is a mediator according to the concurrence of both natures in the unity of his person, it is confessed by all ; for if he were not both God and man he could not mediate between God and men. But whether he be a mediator according to both natures concurring in the work of mediation, there be some that make question. For the clearing whereof the divines distinguish the works of mediation, making them to be of two sorts : of ministry, and of authority. Of ministry, as to pray, to pay the price of redemption, and by dying to satisfy for sin. Of authority, as to pass all good unto us from the Father in the Holy Ghost. Touching the works of ministry, it is agreed on by all, that the person of the Son of God performed them in the nature of man ; for we must distinguish *Principium quod* and *Principium quo* ; that is, the person which doth and suffereth, and that wherein it doth and suffereth such things as are necessary to procure our reconciliation with God. It was the Son of God and Lord of Life that died for us on the cross, but it was the nature of man, not of God, wherein he died ; and it was the nature of God, and infinite excellency of the same, whence the price, value, and worth of his passion grew. The works of authority and power, as to give life, to give the spirit, to raise the dead, to make the blind see, and the dumb to speak, were all per-

formed by the divine nature; yet not without an instrumental concurrence of the nature of man, in sort as hath been before expressed, when I showed how the actions of Christ were divinely-human. If it be alleged that *Opera Trinitatis ad extra* are *indivisa*, that is, that there is nothing that one of the persons of the blessed Trinity doth towards the creatures but they all do it, and, consequently, that those things which Christ did in his divine nature pertained not to the office of a mediator, being common to all the persons; we answer, that as the persons of the blessed Trinity, though they be one and the same God, yet differ *τρόπῳ ὑπάρξεως* in subsistence, and the manner of having and possessing the Deity and divine nature; so though their action be the same, and the work done by them, yet they differ *τρόπῳ πράξεως*, in the manner of doing it: for the Father doth all things authoritative, and the Son subauthoritative, as the schoolmen speak; that is, the Father, as he from whom and of whom all things are; the Son, as he by whom all things are, not as if he were an instrument, but as *principium à principio*, that is, a cause and beginning of things, that hath received the essence it hath, and power of working from another, though the very same that is in the other. And in this sort to quicken, give life, and to impart the spirit of sanctification to whom he pleaseth, especially with a kind of concurring of the human nature, meriting, desiring, and instrumentally assisting, is proper to the Son of God manifested in our flesh, and not common to the whole Trinity; and therefore, notwithstanding the objection taken from the unity of the works of the Divine persons, may be a work of mediation. Bellarmine the Jesuit bringeth many reasons to prove that Christ is not a mediator according to both natures; but that which above all other he most urgeth, is this, “If Christ,” saith he, “be a mediator according to both natures, then either according to both, jointly or severally; not severally, because not according to his Divine nature severally considered, being the party offended. Not according to both jointly; because though in that sort he differ from the Father and the Holy Ghost, neither of which is both God and man, and from the sons of men, who are merely men, yet he differeth not from the Son of God, (who was to be pacified by the Mediator, as well as the Father and the Holy Ghost) neither in nature nor

in person¹." This surely is a silly kind of reasoning; for it is not necessary that a thing should differ from both the extremes according to all that in respect whereof it is of a middle condition, but it is sufficient if it differ in some thing from one, and in some thing from another. The middle colour differeth from the extremes, not in the whole nature of it, but from white in that it hath of blackness, and from black in that it hath of whiteness; but it is a medium, in that it hath something of either of them. So the Son of God incarnate differeth not only from the Father and the Holy Ghost, but from himself as God, in that he is man; and from men, and himself as man, in that he is God; and therefore may mediate, not only between the Father and us men, but also between himself, as God, and us miserable and sinful men. Wherefore to conclude this point, we say, that some of the works of Christ the mediator were the works of his humanity, in respect of the thing done, and had their efficacy, dignity, and value from his divinity, in that they were the works of him that had the divinity dwelling bodily in him; and some the works of his divinity, the human nature concurring only instrumentally, as the giving sight to the blind, raising the dead, remitting of sins, and the like. Neither do we imagine one action of both natures, nor say that Christ died, offered himself on the altar of the Cross, or prayed for us in his divinity, as some slanderously report of us; and therefore all the objections that are mustered against us proceeding from the voluntary mistaking of our sense and meaning (which some will not conceive, that they may have something to say against us,) are all easily cleared, and answered by this explication of the same.

By that which hath been said touching Christ's being a mediator according to both natures, we may easily understand how, and according to what nature, he is head of the Church.

¹ "Si Christus est mediator secundum utramque naturam, vel secundum utramque conjunctim sumptas, vel secundum utramque seorsim acceptas; non secundum utramque simul, Christus enim secundum utramque naturam simul sumptam distat quidem a cæteris hominibus, et etiam a Deo Patre, et Spiritu Sancto; at non distat a Deo Filio nec persona nec natura, et tamen etiam ab illo distare debet, cum et ipse sit pars offensa, ad cujus placationem mediatore opus sit."—Bellarm. De Christo Mediatore, Lib. v. cap. 5. [Tom. i. p. 235.]

In a natural head, Bonaventura¹ observeth three things: the first, that it is *Conforme cæteris membris*; the second, that it is *Principium membrorum*; and the third, that it is *Influxivum sensus et motus*; that is, first, that it hath conformity of nature with the rest of the members of the body; secondly, that it is the first, chiefest, and, in a sort, the beginning of all the members; and thirdly, that from it influence of sense and motion doth proceed. And he sheweth the same to be found in Christ, the mystical head of the Church. For first, he hath conformity of nature with them that are members of his body, the Church, in that he is man: whereupon St Augustine² saith, *Unius naturæ sunt vitis et palmites*; “the vine and the branches are of the same nature:” and secondly, as the natural head is the chiefest and most principal of all the members, so is Christ more excellent than they that are Christ’s. *Omnia membra faciunt unum corpus*, saith St Augustine³, *multum tamen interest inter caput et cætera membra: etenim in cæteris membris non sentis nisi tactu, tangendo sentis in cæteris membris: in capite autem et vides, et audis, et olfacis, et gustas, et tangis*: “All the members make one body, yet is there great difference between the head and the rest of the members; for in the rest a man hath no sense but that of feeling, in the rest he discerneth by feeling; but in the head he seeth, and heareth, and smelleth, and tasteth, and feeleth.” So in the members of Christ’s mystical body, which is the Church, there are found diversities of gifts, operations, and administrations; and to one is

¹ “In capite materiali hæc tria reperiuntur: scil. quod est membris conforme, est membrorum principium, est etiam influxivum sensus et motus, et propterea in Christo reperiuntur omnes sensus perfectiori modo quam in aliis membris. Omnes autem has proprietates est in Christo reperire respectu bonorum, et ideo valde rationabiliter sancta scriptura dicit Christum esse caput ecclesiæ. Sed prima proprietas, scil. conformitas competit ei ratione humanæ naturæ.... Secunda autem proprietas, scil. principiandi competit ratione divinæ naturæ, secundum quod est omnium principium.... Tertia vero proprietas, scil. influendi motum et sensum competit ei ratione divinitatis et humanitatis; dupliciter enim convenit sensum et motum gratiæ influere, aut per modum præparantis, aut per modum impartientis.”—Bonaventura in 3 Sent. Dist. xiii. Art. 2. Quæst. 1. [Tom. v. p. 158. Rom. 1596.]

² August. Tract. 80 in cap. 15 Joan. [Tom. III. part. 2. col. 702.]

³ Id. in Psalm. 39. [Lege xxix. Tom. IV. col. 134, G.]

given the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another faith, to another the gift of healing, to another the operation of great works, and to another prophecy; but to the man Christ the Spirit was given without stint or measure, and in him was found the fulness of all grace. The third property of a natural head, which is the influence of sense and motion, agreeth unto Christ in respect of his humanity and divinity both; for he giveth influence of divine sense and motion two ways; *per modum præparantis*, and *per modum impertientis*, that is, by preparing and making men fit to receive grace, and by imparting it to them that are fitted and prepared. He prepareth and fitteth men to the receipt of grace by the acts of his humanity, in which he suffered death, dying satisfied God's wrath, removed all matter of dislike, merited the favour and acceptation of God, and so made men fit to receive the grace of God and to enjoy his favour: he imparteth and conferreth grace by the operation and working of his divine nature, it being the proper work of God to enlighten the understandings of men, and to soften their hearts. So that to conclude this point, we may resolve, that the grace in respect whereof Christ is head of the Church is of two sorts; the one created and habitual, the other increate and of union. In respect of the one, he giveth grace *effective*, by way of efficiency; in respect of the other, *dispositive*, by way of disposition, fitting us, that an impression of grace may be made in us.

CHAPTER XVII.

OF THE THINGS WHICH CHRIST SUFFERED FOR US, TO PROCURE
OUR RECONCILIATION WITH GOD.

HAVING showed how Christ as a Mediator interposed himself between God and us when we were his enemies, and how he is the head of that blessed company of them that believing in him look for salvation; let us see and consider, first, what he suffered for us, to reconcile us unto God: secondly, what he did for us: thirdly, what the benefits are that he bestoweth on us: and fourthly, to whom he com-

mitted the dispensation of the rich treasures of his graces, the word of reconciliation, and the guiding and governing of the people which he purchased as a peculiar inheritance to himself.

Touching the first, to wit the sufferings of Christ, he was by them to satisfy the justice of God his Father displeased with us for sin, that so we might be reconciled unto him. Wherefore, that we may the better conceive what was necessary to be done or suffered to satisfy the justice of God, we must consider sin in the nature of a wrong, and in the nature of sin. In the nature of a wrong; and so two things were required for the pacifying of God's wrath: for first, he that hath done wrong must restore that he unjustly took away from him whom he wronged; and secondly, he must do something in recompense of the wrong he did; as if he took away another man's good name, by false and lying reports, he must not only restore it to him again by acknowledging that the things were untrue which in defamation of him he had spoken, but he must also take all occasions to raise, continue, and increase a good opinion of him. If sin be considered in the nature of sin it implieth in it two things: *debitum pœnæ*, and *debitum neglectæ obedientiæ*, that is, a debt of punishment, and a debt of obedience then neglected, when it should have been performed; and therefore in the satisfaction that is to reconcile us to God displeased with us for sin as sin, two things must be implied: for first, the punishment must be sustained that sin deserved; and secondly, that obedience must be performed that should have been yielded whilst sin was committed, but was neglected. For if only the punishment be sustained we may escape the condemnation of death, but we cannot inherit eternal life, unless the righteousness and obedience which God's law requireth be found in us also. Now the law of God requireth obedience, not only in the present time, and time to come, but from the beginning of our life to the end of the same, if we desire to inherit the promised blessedness. And though the performance of that obedience that was neglected may seem to be in the nature of merit rather than satisfaction; yet in that it is not simply the meriting and procuring of favour and acceptation, but the recovering of lost friendship, and the regaining of renewed love, it is rightly esteemed to pertain unto satisfaction.

Touching sin considered in the nature of an offence and wrong, and the things required to pacify God's wrath in that respect, there is no question but that the sinner himself that wronged God in sinning, must by sorrow of heart, disliking and detesting, and by confession of mouth, condemning former evils, restore that glory to God he took from him; and seek and take all occasions the weakness of his means will afford, to glorify God as much as he dishonoured him before: and God accepteth weak endeavours as sufficient in this kind, Christ having perfectly satisfied for us; as a public person may accept of a mean and weak satisfaction for the wrong done to him, but must inflict punishment answerable to the fault, to satisfy public justice offended by that wrong. Wherefore, passing from this kind of satisfaction, let us speak of that other that God requireth, standing in the suffering of punishments due to sin. Some define this kind of satisfaction to be the suffering of the punishments that God inflicteth, or wherewith a man voluntarily punisheth himself: but this is not a good definition. For as a thief or murderer may not lay violent hands on himself, and be his own executioner when he hath offended, to satisfy public justice, but must submit himself to that which authority will lay on him; so it is so far from being any satisfaction to God's justice, for a man when he hath sinned, to become his own executioner, and to punish himself for his sin to satisfy the justice of God, that it highly displeaseth God. It is true indeed, that we may lawfully afflict ourselves, not to satisfy God's justice, but to purge out the dross of that sinful impurity that cleaveth to us, and to cure the wounds of our souls, as we may afflict ourselves by fasting, watching, and abstaining from many things otherwise lawful, for the freeing of ourselves from the remains of our former excessive and immoderate delight in eating, drinking, surfeiting, and riot, and other abuses of the good creatures of God. So that we must not define satisfaction to be the suffering of those punishments that God inflicteth, or wherewith the sinner punisheth himself; for it is only the sustaining of those that God in justice doth inflict. And in this sort Christ satisfied his Father's wrath, not by punishing himself, but by being obedient to his Father even unto the death. Wherefore let us proceed more particularly to consider the satisfactory sufferings of Christ, and see first,

what punishments Christ suffered to pacify his Father's wrath; and secondly, what the manner of his passion was.

Touching the punishments that Christ suffered, they were not ordinary, but beyond measure, grievous, bitter, and insupportable: yea, such as would have made any mere creature to sink down under the burthen of them to the bottom of hell. For he suffered grievous things from all the things in heaven, earth, and hell, and in all that any way pertained to him. He suffered at the hands of God his Father, and of men; of Jews, of Gentiles, of enemies insulting, of friends forsaking, of the prince of darkness, and all his cruel and merciless instruments; of the elements of the world, the sun denying to give him light, the air breath, and the earth supportance. He suffered in all that pertained to him; in his name, being condemned as a blasphemer, as an enemy to Moses, the law, the temple, and worship of God; to his own nation, to Cæsar, and the Romans; a glutton, a companion with publicans and sinners, a Samaritan, one that had a devil, and did all his miracles by the power of Beelzebub. In the things he possessed, when they stripped him out of his garments, and cast lots on his seamless coat. In his friends greatly distressed and discomfited with the sight of those things that fell out unto him, according to that which was prophesied before: "The shepherd shall be smitten, and the sheep shall be scattered¹." In his body, when his hands and feet were nailed, his sides gored, his head pierced with the crown of thorns, his cheeks swollen with buffeting, his face defiled with spitting upon, his eyes offended with beholding the scornful behaviour of his proud insulting enemies, his ears with hearing the words of their execrable blasphemy, his taste with the myrrh and gall that they gave him in his drink, his smell with the stench and horror of the place wherein he was crucified, being a place of dead men's skulls. Lastly, in his soul distressed with fears, and compassed about with sorrows besetting him on every side, and that even unto death. In so woful a sort did he take on him our defects, and suffer our punishments.

But, because we may as well enlarge and amplify Christ's passions and sufferings too much, as extenuate them too much, let us see, if it be possible, the utmost extent of that he suf-

¹ Mark xiv. 27.

ferred. For the clearing hereof some say¹, that he suffered all those punishments that were be seeming him, or behoofful for us: that he suffered all those punishments, that neither prejudice the plenitude of sanctity, nor science. But, that we may the better inform ourselves touching this point, we must observe, that the punishments of sin are of three sorts: first, *culpa*: secondly, *ex culpa, et ad culpam*: thirdly, *ex culpa, sed nec culpa, nec ad culpam*: that is, first, sin: secondly, something proceeding from sin, and inducing to sin: thirdly, things proceeding from sin, that neither are sins, nor incline and induce to sin. Examples of the first are, envy, afflicting the mind of the proud man, grievous disorders accompanying the drunkard, and a reprobate sense, following the contempt of God's worship and service²: of the second, natural concupiscence, proneness to evil, difficulty to do good, contrariety in the faculties of the soul, and repugnance and resistance of the meaner against the better: examples of the third, which are things proceeding from sin, but neither sins, nor inclinations to sin, are hunger, thirst, weakness, nakedness, and death itself. The punishments of this last sort only Christ suffered, and neither of the former two; for neither was there sin in him, nor any thing inclining him to evil, or discouraging him from good. The punishments of this kind are of two sorts; natural and personal: natural are such as follow the whole nature of man, as hunger, thirst, labour, weariness, and death itself: personal are such as grow out of some imperfection and defect in the virtue and faculty forming the body, disorder in diet, or some violence offered; and these are found but in some particular men, and not in all men generally, as leprosy, agues, gouts, and the like. All those punishments that are punishments only, that are from without, and that are common to the whole nature of men, Christ suffered, that came to be a Redeemer of all without respect of persons; but such as flow from sin dwelling within, or proceed from particular causes, or are proper to some, and not common to all, he suffered not.

¹ "Respondeo dicendum quod absque dubio Christus non omnes defectus nostros assumpsit, sicut dicit magister in littera, sed illos tantum quos ipsum assumere decuit et nobis expediens fuit."—Bonaventur. in 3 Sent. Dist. xv. Quæst. 2. [Tom. v. p. 186.]

² "The punishments of this second sort are sins, though the Schoolmen do not esteem them to be so."

The punishments that are punishments only, and not sin, and are common to the whole nature of man, are likewise of two sorts: for either they are suffered for sin imputed, or sin inherent. For one may be punished either for his own fault, or the fault of another in some sort imputed to him. When a man is punished for his own fault, he hath remorse of conscience, blaming and condemning him as having brought such evils upon himself, by his own folly. But when a man is punished for another man's fault, whereof he hath been no cause by example, persuasion, help, or consent, he can have no remorse of conscience. Now our Saviour Christ suffered the punishments of the sins of other men, not his own, and therefore he was free from remorse of conscience, though it be generally found in all men, and be neither sin, nor inducement to sin.

Lastly, the punishments that are punishments only, and not sin, that are common to the whole nature of man, and suffered not for the faults of him that suffereth them, but for the sins of other, are of two sorts; for either they are the punishments of sin eternally remaining in stain and guilt, or broken off, ceasing, and repented of.

The punishments of sin eternally remaining, must, according to the rules of divine justice, be eternal, and consequently joined with desperation, which always is found where there is an impossibility of any better estate for ever: but it¹ is no

¹ "Est autem secunda conclusio quam isti damnaverunt hæc: 'Peccato mortali finiti temporis non debetur pœna infinita secundum tempus, sed finita tantum.' . . . Pro declaratione conclusionis, . . . primo notandum, quod in peccato duo possunt considerari, conversio ad bonum creatum, et aversio a bono incommutabili et increato.

"Secundo nota, quod per tempus possumus intelligere solum tempus viæ, et hoc modo certum est, quod neque peccatum nec quicquam aliud ad hominem pertinens possit esse infinitum secundum tempus, cum tempus viæ cujuslibet viatoris sit non solum duratione et finitum, sed etiam breve: alio modo possumus intelligere per tempus tempus viæ et termini, et hoc modo accipitur in conclusione, et sic aliquid potest in homine durare per tempus infinitum, ut patet."—Picus Mirandula, Apolog. Quæst. 2. [Tom. i. p. 100. Bas. 1601.]

"Dicitur quod si malus perpetuo vixisset, perpetuo peccasset, et ideo perpetuo punitur, quia perpetuo peccavit in voluntate; et est ratio Gregorii, Moral. Contra, aliquis peccat cum proposito pœnitendi, ergo nec explicite nec implicite in voto perpetuo peccat. Respondeo, exponit se perpetuitati peccati sicut dictum est in solutione de projici-

way necessary, neither doth the justice of God require, that the punishments of sin repented of, ceasing, and forsaken, should be everlasting, or joined with despair. For, as the divines do note, that there are three things to be considered in sin: the aversion from an infinite and incommutable good; the inordinate conversion to a finite good; and the continuing in the same, or ceasing from it: so to these several things in sin, there are three several things answering in the punishment of it. For to the aversion which is objectively infinite, there answereth *pœna damni*, the loss of God, which is an infinite loss; to the inordinate conversion of the sinner to things transitory there answereth *pœna sensus*, a sensible smart and grief intensively finite, as the pleasure the sinner taketh in the transitory things he inordinately loveth is finite; to the eternity of sin remaining everlastingly in stain and guilt, or the continuance of it but for a time, answereth the eternity of punishment, or the suffering of the same but for a time.

It is true that every sinner sinneth *in suo æterno*, as St Gregory¹ speaketh, in that he would sin ever if he might live ever; and that every sinner casteth himself by sinning into an impossibility of ever ceasing to sin of himself, as a man that casteth himself into a deep pit can never of himself rise out of it again; and therefore naturally eternity of punishment is due to sin: but, if by force of divine operation, men be framed to cease from sin, and to turn from it unto God, the justice of God requireth not eternity of punishment, but only extremity answerable to the grievousness of sin. Wherefore seeing our Saviour Christ suffered only for those sins which he meant to break off by framing the sinners to repentance, it was no way necessary for the satisfying of divine justice that he should endure eternal punishment.

If it be said that all do not repent, nor cease from doing ill, we easily grant it: but it is likewise to be known, that

ente se in foveam; et hoc maxime permanendo toto tempore vitæ sine poenitentia.—Scotus in 4 Sent. Dist. xlv. Quæst. 4 in resp. ad argumenta principalia. [Tom. x. p. 287.]

¹ “*Iniqui ideo cum fine deliquerunt, quia cum fine vixerunt. Voluissent quippe sine fine vivere ut sine fine potuissent in iniquitatibus permanere. Nam magis appetunt peccare quam vivere.*”—Greg. Moral. Lib. xxxiv. cap. 12. [Al. cap. 19. Tom. i. col. 1132. Par. 1705.]

the satisfaction of Christ is not applicable to all sinners, not through any defect in itself, but through the incapacity of them to whom it should be applied. So that as Christ died, and satisfied God's wrath sufficiently for all, but effectually only for the elect and chosen; so likewise he giveth grace to cease from sin, if the fault were not in themselves, sufficiently to all: but to the elect and chosen, whom he foreknew before the world was made, he giveth grace effectually, that his passion may be applied unto them, and they really and indeed made partakers of it.

They seem therefore to be deceived, who think that the excellency of the person of Christ dispensed with the eternity of punishment, which otherwise to satisfy divine justice he was to have suffered; and thereupon infer that it might also dispense with the grievousness and extremity of punishment, that otherwise he was to have endured. For the worth and excellency of his person was neither to dispense with the time nor grievousness of his punishments, but to make the passion of one available for many: otherwise, if it might have dispensed with one degree of extremity of punishment due to sin, it might also have dispensed with two, and consequently with all, as Scotus¹ aptly noteth, though to another purpose.

These things being thus distinguished, it is easy to answer that question that hath troubled many: whether Christ suffered all the punishments of sin or not. For we may safely pronounce, as I think, that Christ suffered the whole general punishment of sin, that only excepted which is sin, or consequent upon the inherence and eternity of sin that is punished, as remorse of conscience and desperation. If any man shall go further, and ask, whether to satisfy God's justice Christ suffered the pains of hell or not; it will be answered, that he suffered not the pains of hell in *specie* or *loco*, that is, either in kind or place; but some think that he suffered pains and punishments conformable and answerable to them in extremity, that only excepted which is sin, or consequent upon the inherence and eternity of the sin of such as are punished in hell.

¹ "Misericordia liberans totam miseriam excludit; parcens, sed non liberans, partem ejus quæ debetur excludit."—Scotus in 4 Sent. Dist. xlv. Quæst. 4. [Tom. x. p. 283.]

Concerning *pœna sensus*, that is, sensible smart and grief, cardinal Cusanus¹, a famous learned man, is clearly of opinion that Christ suffered extremity of such pain answerable to that sensible smart and grief that is endured in hell; but the doubt is principally of the other kind of punishment, named *pœna damni*, which is the loss of God. For the clearing of which point, Scotus² aptly observeth divers things. For first, he sheweth that punishment is the discernible want of some fitting good in an intellectual nature, and the presence of some evil in the same. Secondly, that the good that is in an intellectual nature is of two sorts; the one of virtue, the other of sweet, joyful, and pleasing delight; and that, though both these concur sometimes, as in the fruition of God in heaven, wherein the perfection of virtue, and the fulness of joy and delight do meet together; yea, that though every thing that is virtuous be delightful; yet it is not so much the height of virtue as of delight that is to be judged happiness. Thirdly, he inferreth from hence, that there are two kinds of punishment consisting in the loss of God: whereof the one is, the want of that virtue whereby the soul is to

¹ "Passio Christi, qua major nulla esse potest, fuit ut damnatorum qui magis damnari nequeunt, scilicet usque ad poenam infernalem. In ejus nomine dicit propheta: 'Dolores inferni circumdederunt me, eduxisti tamen ab inferno animam meam.' Sed ipse solus est qui per talem mortem intravit in gloriam illam, illam poenam sensus conformem damnatis in inferno pati voluit certe in gloriam Dei Patris sui, ut ostenderet quod ei obediendum sit, usque ad extremum supplicium."—Nicolaus Cusanus, Exercitationum, Lib. x. p. 659. [Bas. 1565.]

² "Punitio est perceptibilis carentia boni convenientis in natura intellectuali, vel perceptibilis præsentia mali disconvenientis in eadem. Bonum autem intellectuale in genere duplex est, bonum scilicet commodi, et bonum honesti. Bonum quidem utile quod ponitur tertium, ad alterutrum illorum reducitur, secundum quod ad ipsum ordinatur, et licet quandoque in eodem concurrant rationes boni commodi et honesti, ut in fruitione Dei in patria, imo generaliter omne honestum sit commodum, licet non e converso, tamen summum commodum est beatitudo; et esset commodum, licet per impossibile non esset honestum. Summum etiam est charitas, et esset honestum, licet per impossibile non esset commodum; ergo in natura intellectuali duplex punitio per privationem duplicis boni. Prima vocatur malum injustitiæ, sive culpæ, et potest dici obstinatio in peccato: secunda vocatur pœna damni, vel damnum, vel damnatio."—Scotus in 4 Sent. Dist. xlvi. Quæst. 4. [p. 270.]

be joined and knit unto God; the other, the want of that delight and pleasure that is to be found in God. That the former is an evil of unrighteousness and sin, and may be called an obstinacy in sin, and is nothing else but sin not remitted nor removed, *pœna derelicta non inflicta*, that is, no new evil brought in upon the sinner, but that left in him that he wrought in himself. The other is more properly named *pœna damni*, or *damnum*, that is, the punishment of loss, or a loss and damage. It were impious to think that Christ suffered the former kind; but that he suffered this latter kind of punishment of loss and damage, many great divines are of opinion. For though as he was joined to God *affectione justitiæ*, that is, by the affection of virtue or justice, he could not be divided or separated from him, no not for a moment, because he could not but love him, fear him, trust in him, and give him the praise and glory that belongeth to him; yet, as he was to be joined to him *affectione commodi*, that is, by that affection that seeketh pleasing content in enjoying those ineffable delights and pleasures that are found in him, he might be, and was for a time, divided from him: for, as very great and grave divines do think, he was *destitutus omni solatio*, that is, destitute and void of all that solace he was wont to find in God, in that fearful hour of darkness, and of his doleful passion. "As," saith Melchior Canus¹, "Christ in the time of his life miraculously restrained and kept within the closet of his secret spirit the happiness that he enjoyed in seeing God, that it should not spread farther and communicate itself to the inferior faculties of his soul, or impart the brightness of it to the body; so in the hour of his passion, his very spirit was withholden from any pleasure it might take in so pleasing an object, as is the essence, majesty, and glory of God, which even then he clearly beheld: so that Christ never wanted the vision of

¹ "Sicut per totam vitam Dominus gloriam animæ quasi premebat, ne in corpus efflueret; sic saltem in cruce retinuit gaudium, quod suapte natura ex clara Dei visione prodiret. . . . Quanquam et fruitio sine gaudio intelligi potest, fruitur enim arboris suæ fructibus tunc etiam homo cum per morbum voluptatem nullam capit ex eis. Ita Christus non solum videbat, sed etiam fruebatur, quamvis derelictus a Deo, omnique penitus solatio destitutus non gaudebat."—Melchior Canus, De Loc. Theol. [Lib. xii. cap. 14. p. 723, Colon. Agrip. 1605.]

that object, which naturally maketh all them happy that behold it, and filleth them with such joy as no heart of mortal man can conceive, or tongue express."

But as it was strange, and yet most true, in the time of his life, that his soul enjoyed heaven-happiness, and that yet neither the inferior faculties thereof were admitted into any fellowship of the same, nor his body glorified, but subject to misery and passion; so it fell out by the special dispensation of Almighty God, in the time of his death, and in that fearful hour of darkness, that his soul seeing God, the pleasure and delight that naturally cometh from so pleasing an object, stayed, withheld, and communicated not itself unto it: as a man in great distress taketh no pleasure in those things that otherwise exceedingly affect him. This his conceit, he saith, he communicated to very great and worthy divines, while he was yet but a young man, and that they were so far from disliking it, that they approved it exceedingly. But some man will say, it is not possible in this life to feel extremity of pains, answerable to the pains of hell, more than on earth to enjoy the happiness of heaven; and that therefore it is absurd to grant, that Christ in the days of his flesh suffered in this world extremity of pain answerable to the pains of hell. Hereunto it is answered, that in ordinary course it is impossible for any man living in this world, either to enjoy the happiness of heaven, or feel the pains of hell: but that, as Christ was at the same time both *Viator* and *Comprehensor*, that is, a man like unto us that journey here in this world towards heaven-happiness, and yet happy with that happiness that ordinarily is found nowhere but in heaven; so he might suffer that extremity of pain, and have that apprehension of afflictive evils, that ordinarily is nowhere to be found in this world, even while he lived here on earth. Luther¹ saith truly, that if a man could perfectly see his own evils, the sight thereof would be a perfect hell unto him: now it is certain that Christ saw all the evils of punishment before

¹ "Hoc ratum est et verissimum, sive id credat homo sive non, nullam esse posse in homine cruciatum tantum, qui pessimum sit malorum quæ in ipso sunt, adeo sunt longe plura et majora in ipso mala, quam quæ sentit. Si enim suum malum sentiret, infernum sentiret, nam infernum in seipso habet."—Luther. Consol. pro laborant. cap. 1. De Spectro primo, Tom. II. [Fol. 12, B. Witteberg. 1562.]

expressed, to which he voluntarily subjected himself, to satisfy divine justice coming fierce and violently upon him, with as clear a sight, and as perfect an apprehension of them, as is to be had in the other world.

CHAPTER XVIII.

OF THE NATURE AND QUALITY OF THE PASSION AND SUFFERING OF CHRIST.

HITHERTO we have spoken of the punishments that Christ sustained and suffered to satisfy the justice and pacify the wrath of his Father. Now it remaineth that we come to take a view of the nature and quality of his passion and suffering, consisting partly in his fear and agony before, and partly in his bitter sorrow and distress in the very act of that doleful tragedy. Touching the first, the Scripture testifieth, that “he feared exceedingly¹,” and desired “the cup might pass from him².” Touching the second, that “he was beset with sorrows even unto the death³,” and that in his extremity “he cried aloud, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me⁴?” But touching both these passions of fear and sorrow, it is noted, that, whereas there are three kinds of faults found in the passions of men’s minds⁵; the first, that they arise before reason be consulted, or give direction; the second, that they proceed farther than they should, and stay

¹ Mark xiv. 33. Matt. xxvi. 37.

² Matt. xxvi. 39.

³ Matt. xxvi. 38.

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 46.

⁵ “Rationem attingi per modum rationis repugnat perfectioni sapientiæ; non autem attingi per modum naturæ, hoc enim est quod facit hominem cadere a statu et perfectione sapientiæ; videlicet, quod ejus ratio cedat et succumbat passionibus, non autem quod sentiat passiones; et ita per modum naturæ non aufert rationem propassionis. Aliud enim est passionem experiri, aliud a passionibus perturbari. Perturbari enim est subjici. Experiri autem potest aliquis passiones et illis superferri; et sic fuit in anima Christi, quæ secundum rationem non tantum passiones corporis experiebatur dolore acutissimo, sed secundum rationem deliberativam passionibus corporis superferebatur gaudio virtuoso.”—Bonaventura in 3 Sent. Dist. xvi. Art. 2. Quæst. 2. [Tom. v. p. 199. Rom. 1596.]

not when they are required; and the third, that they transport reason and judgment itself; Christ had these passions, but in a sort free from all these evils: for neither did they arise in him before reason gave direction, whereupon he is said to “have troubled or moved himself¹” in the case of Lazarus, for whom he greatly sorrowed; neither did they proceed any farther, if once reason and judgment commanded a stay and retreat, whereupon they are called *propassions*² rather than passions; not because (as Kellison³ ignorantly supposeth) reason preventeth them, and causeth them to arise, though it be true it doth so; but because they are but fore-runners to passions at liberty, and beginnings of passions to be staid at pleasure, rather than full and perfect passions; and therefore much less had they any power to transport judgment and reason itself. From these general considerations of the passions of Christ, let us proceed to take a more particular view of the chief particulars of his passions, to wit, fear and sorrow.

Fear is described to be a retiring, or flying back from a thing, if it be good, because it is too high and excellent above the reach, and without the extent of our condition and power; if it be evil, because it is hard to be escaped. So that the proper and adequate object of fear, is not, as some suppose, future evil, but difficulty, greatness, and excellency: which found in things good, makes us know we cannot at all attain them, or at least that we cannot attain them but with too great difficulty and labour; in evil, that they will not easily be overmastered or escaped.

¹ John xi. 33.

² “Dominus ut veritatem probaret assumpti hominis vere quidem contristatus est, sed ne passio in anima ejus dominaretur, per propassionem cœpit contristari.”—Hieron. in Matt. xxvi. [Tom. vii. col. 218.]

³ “When in the garden he feared death, that feare was prevented, and commanded by reason, and so was deliberate and no sinne at al, because it is natural to feare death, and if withal the superior part of the mynde be resolute, and wil not for that feare transgres God’s law or offend conscience, it increaseth the merit of martyrdome, or sufferance of death, because it augmenteth the difficulty. Wherefore divines cal Christ’s passions *propassions*, because he alwayes prævented them, and commanded them to arise, and therefore the evangelist sayth not, that Christ was perturbed or troubled with his passions, as we are, but that ‘he troubled himselfe.’”—Kellison, “Survey of the New Religion,” Book III. chap. 10. p. 177. [Doway, 1605.]

The difficulty, greatness, and excellency, found in things that are good, causeth fear of reverence, which maketh us step back, and not to meddle at all with things that are too high and excellent for us, nor with things hard without good advice: and causeth us to give place to those of better condition, and to acknowledge and profess by all significations of body and mind, the distance and disproportion that we know to be between them and us, together with our dependence of them, or subjection to them. This kind of fear causeth and produceth all acts of reverence and adoration: it is found in the angels, and spirits of just and perfect men, and is more excellent than any other virtue.

The greatness that is found in things that are evil causeth a fear declining them as evil, which is of diverse sorts: for first, there is an human fear, which maketh men more decline the loss of their lives and good estates, than the loss of the favour of God: secondly, there is a mundane fear, that causeth them to decline the disfavour of the world, more than the displeasure of Almighty God; and these two kinds of fear drive men from God. But there are other kinds which drive them unto God. The first whereof is a servile fear, that maketh men leave the act of sin, both inward and outward, to avoid punishment, though they retain the love and liking of it: the second is an initial fear, that maketh them cast from them the very desire of sinning, not out of the love of God, which they have not yet attained unto, but out of the consideration of the woeful consequence of it: and thirdly, there is a filial fear, proceeding from the love of God, causing us to decline the offending of him whom we so dearly love, and of whom we are so dearly loved, more than any evil whatsoever.

The former kinds of fear that drive men from God could not be found in Christ, who was not only nearly joined unto God, but God himself blessed for evermore: for neither did he prize life, nor the favour of the world that knew him not, at any higher rate than was fit. Of the latter sorts of fear, neither servile nor initial were in him, that was free from all sin; and touching filial fear, being well assured of his own power, in respect whereof it was impossible for him to be drawn to the committing of any evil, though he had that part of it which standeth in declining the offence of God

more than any evil in the world, yet not that other, that proceedeth from the consideration of the danger of being drawn thereunto: so that he could not fear lest he should fall into sin. Besides all these kinds of fear, whereof some drive men from God, and some bring them to God, there is another which is the ground of them all, named natural fear, which is the declining of any thing that is hurtful, or contrary to the desired good of him that feareth: this natural fear, as also the fear of reverence, and that part of filial fear that is the declining of sin, and the displeasing of God, was found in Christ, as all other sinless and harmless affections were: for in the nature of man, he revered and adored the majesty of God his Father; and with a natural fear declined death, and the bitterness of that cup he was to drink of, and with a filial fear declined the offending of God his Father more than hell itself.

But (passing by the fear of reverence, and that part of filial fear that was found in Christ, concerning which there is no question among the divines) that we may the better discern both what his natural fear was, and in respect whereof, we must note that fear¹ is, first, in respect of things which cannot be avoided, neither by resistance and encounter, nor by flying from them: which things though they may seem rather to make an impression of sorrow than fear, because in respect of their certainty they are rather apprehended as present than future; yet for that we know not experimentally how we shall be afflicted with them, and in what sort we shall sustain and bear them, we may rightly be said to fear them: secondly, in respect of such things as may be escaped or overcome with a kind of uncertainty of event, and danger of the issue: thirdly, in respect of such as may be escaped

¹ “Apprehenditur malum futurum sub ratione præsentis, quando ut certum apprehenditur, et ideo incertum seu possibile vitari esse debet malum futurum quod timorem ingerit.

“Quoad secundum, distinctio est. Timor potest considerari quantum ad duo; primo, quantum ad motum appetitus sensitivi ex apprehenso malo futuro; secundo, quantum ad motum ejusdem ex apprehenso malo futuro incerto. Prima conclusio est: In Christo fuit timor quo ad primum. Secunda conclusio est: In Christo non fuit timor quo ad secundum.”—Cajetan. in Aquin. Part. 3. Quæst. 15. Art. 7. [Tom. iv. Ven. 1594.]

or overcome without any uncertainty of the event or issue, though not without great conflict and labour.

These kinds of natural fear thus distinguished, it is easy to see what Christ feared, and in what sort. For first, he feared death, and the stroke of the justice of God his Father, sitting on the tribunal or judgment-seat, to punish the sins of men, for whom he stood forth to answer that day; and secondly, he feared everlasting destruction. The former of these he feared, as things impossible to be escaped, in respect of the resolution and purpose of God his Father, that by his satisfactory death and suffering, and no other way, man should be delivered. The latter he feared, that is, declined as a thing he knew he should escape without all doubt or uncertainty of event, though not without conflicting with the temptations of Satan, and the enduring of many bitter and grievous things: for it was no otherwise possible for him, having put himself into the communion of our nature, to escape the swallowing up of that gulf into which wicked sinners sink down, but by resisting the temptations of sin, that it might not enter into him, by breaking off the same in others, and by suffering whatsoever it had deserved. But some man will say, Beza teacheth that *Christus veritus est succumbere, et absorberi a morte*¹; that is, “that Christ feared to sink down, and to be swallowed up of death;” and consequently, that he feared everlasting destruction, with an uncertainty of his escape from the same.

It is true that Beza saith that Christ feared to sink down, and to be swallowed up of death; yet doth not that follow which is alleged as a consequent of his saying, nor anything contrary to that hath been said of us. For whereas there is a double apprehension² of reason in Christ, the one named

¹ “*Peccata non unius hominis aliqua, sed omnium electorum omnia homo unus ipse fragilis caducus imbecillis sustinet. Et miramur eum expavescere, consternari, lacrymari, clamare, repugnantia quodammodo petere, sanguinem sudare, se derelictum vociferari? Sed tamen nunquam diffidit. Sane. Cur enim hoc dubium est? Ergo non veritus est succumbere, et absorberi a morte. Hoc vero pernego. Quo jure id faciam, facile fuerit ex his cognoscere. Si verba spectes, non petit confirmationem animi, sed liberationem a periculo.*”—Beza, Annotat. in Heb. v. 7. [p. 511, Par. 1565.]

² “*Secundum communem sententiam magistrorum passio Christi non solum stetit in sensualitate, nec tantum pervenit ad rationem*

superior, that looketh into things with all circumstances; the other inferior, that presenteth to the mind of man some circumstances, and not all; Beza teacheth that Christ feared to sink down, and to be swallowed up of death, that is, that he so declined the swallowing gulf of death, out of which he saw no escape within the view of inferior reason, presenting unto him this hideous and destroying evil, in its own nature endless, without showing the issue out of the same; that yet notwithstanding simply he feared it not: superior reason clearly showing him the issue out of it. This will not seem strange unto us, if we consider that in Christ every faculty, power, and part was suffered, notwithstanding the perfection found in some other, to do that which properly pertained to it; and from hence it is easy to discern how it came to pass, that Christ should desire and pray for that which he knew should never be granted, as namely, that the cup¹ of death might pass from him. For the sense of nature and inferior reason presented death and the ignominy of the cross unto him, as they are in themselves evil, without the consideration of any good to follow, and so caused a desire to decline them, expressed in the prayer he made: but superior reason considering them with all circumstances, and knowing God's resolution to be such, that the world should thereby be saved, and by no other means, persuaded to a willing acceptance of them. Between these desires and resolutions there was a diversity, but no contrariety; a subordination, but no repugnance or resistance. There was no contrariety, because they were not in respect of the same circumstances; for death, as death, is to be avoided: neither did superior reason ever dislike this judgment of the inferior faculties, but showed farther and higher considerations, wherein it was to be accepted and embraced. There was no repugnance or resistance, because the one yielded to the other: for even as a man that is sick,

inferiorem, sed extendit se usque ad superiorem portionem."—Bonaventura, in 3 Sent. Dist. xvi. Art. 2. Quæst. 2. [Tom. v. p. 200.]

"Circa istam decimam quintam distinctionem, in qua magister agit de defectibus assumptis cum natura humana, quæro unum: Utrum scilicet in anima Christi secundum portionem superiorem fuerit verus dolor? Quod non. Contraria non possunt esse in eodem: gaudium et tristitia sunt hujusmodi; ergo. . . ."—Scotus, in 3 Sent. Dist. xv. Quæst. unic. [Tom. vii. p. 326. Lugd. 1639.]

¹ Matt. xxvi. 39.

considering the potion prescribed to him by the physician to be bitter and unpleasant, declineth it while he stayeth within the bounds and confines of that consideration, but, when casting his eyes farther, he is showed by the physician the happy operation of good that is in it, he willingly accepteth it, in that it is beneficial and good; so Christ, considering death as in itself evil, and contrary to nature, while he stayed within the bounds and confines of that consideration, shunned and declined it; and yet, as the means of man's salvation, joyfully embraced it, accepting that he refused, and refusing that he accepted. "There is a thing," saith Hugo de Sancto Victore¹, "that is *bonum in se*, 'good in itself,' and the good of every other thing. There is a thing good in itself, and yet good but to certain purposes only. And there is a thing evil in itself, and yet good to some purposes." The two former sorts of things may be desired simply and absolutely: the third cannot but only respectively to certain ends: and of this kind was the death of the cross, with all the woeful tormentings concurring with the same, which simply Christ shunned and declined, but respectively to the ends above specified willingly embraced. The Papists² impute I know not what impiety to Calvin, for that he saith, Christ corrected the desire and wish that suddenly came from him. But they might easily understand, if they pleased, that he is far from thinking that any desire or expressing of desire was sudden in Christ, as rising in him without consent of reason, or that he was inconsiderate in anything he did or spake: but his meaning is, that some

¹ "Bonum ergo summum est, quod ipsum bonum est, et ad omne bonum bonum est. Medium vero bonum est quod ipsum bonum est, et ad aliquid bonum est. Bonum autem infimum et quasi extrarium et denominative solum et conductum et non proprium bonum, quod ad aliquid bonum est, et ipsum bonum non est."—Hugo de Sancto Victore, *Erudit. Theol. de Sacram. Fid. Lib. i. Part. 4. cap. 19.* [Tom. III. p. 374, Mogunt. 1617.]

² "Quando Christus emisit verba desperationis, ut Calvinus dicit, vel emisit deliberata voluntate, vel non. Si primum, ergo vel vere desperavit et peccavit. Si secundum, ergo in Christo fuit inordinatio passionum, quandoquidem potuit metus prævenire rationem et extorquere vocem desperationis invita voluntate.

"Adde, quod idem Calvinus dicit, ista verba, 'Deus meus,' esse correctionem illorum: 'Quare me dereliquisti.'"—Bellarm. *De Anima Christi, Lib. iv. cap. 8.* [Tom. I. p. 219.]

desires which he expressed proceeded from inferior reason, that considereth not all circumstances, and that he corrected, and revoked the same, not as evil, but as not proceeding from the full and perfect consideration of all things fit to be thought upon, before a full resolution be passed.

Thus having spoken of Christ's fear and agony before his passion, it remaineth that we proceed to speak of the sorrows that afflicted and distressed him in his passion. These sorrows were such and so great, that being beset and compassed about with them on every side, he professed "his soul was heavy even unto the death¹." Yea, such was the bitterness of his soul, that, pressed with the weight and burthen of grievous and insupportable evils, he was forced to cry out aloud, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me²?" These words of sorrowful passion, the papists say, Calvin thought to be words of despair, and that Christ despaired when he uttered them. Surely this shameless slander sheweth that they that thus speak they care not what, are desperately malicious, and maintain a desperate cause that cannot be upholden but by falsehood and lying. But Calvin is far from any such execrable and hellish blasphemy: for having by occasion of these words amplified the sorrows and distresses of Christ in the time of his passion, he³ saith there were some that charged him that he said these words were words of desperation, and that Christ despaired when he uttered them; but he accurseth such hellish blasphemy, and pronounceth that howsoever the flesh apprehended destroying evils, and inferior reason showed no issue out of the same, yet there was ever a most sure resolved persuasion resting in his heart that he should undoubtedly prevail against them, and overcome them.

Wherefore passing over this wicked calumnation of our

¹ Matt. xxvi. 38.

² Matt. xxvii. 46.

³ "Absurdum videtur Christo elapsam esse desperationis vocem. Solutio facilis est, quanquam sensus carnis exitium apprehenderet, fixam tamen stetisse fidem in ejus corde qua Deum præsentem intuitus est, de cujus absentia conqueritur. Diximus alibi quomodo Deitas cesserit carnis infirmitati, quatenus salutis nostræ interfuit, ut omnes redemptoris partes Christus impleret. Discrimen autem notavimus inter naturæ sensum et fidei notitiam; quare nihil obstat quominus Dei alienationem mente conceperit Christus, prout sensus communis dictabat, et simul fide retinuerit Deum sibi esse propitium."—Calvin. Comment. in Matt. xxvii. [In Harmon. Evang. p. 321, Amstel. 1667.]

adversaries, let us see in what sense Christ the Son of God complained of dereliction, and cried aloud unto his Father, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" For the clearing hereof the divines do note, that there are six kinds of dereliction or forsaking, whereof Christ may be thought to have complained. The first whereof is by disunion of person; the second, by loss of grace; the third, by diminution or weakening of grace; the fourth, by want of assurance of future deliverance, and present support; the fifth, by denial of protection; the sixth, by withdrawing of solace, and destituting the forsaken of all comfort. It is impious once to think that Christ was forsaken any of the four first ways. For the unity of his person was never dissolved; his graces were never either taken away or diminished; neither was it possible he should want assurance of future deliverance and present support, that was eternal God and Lord of life. But the two last ways he may rightly be said to have been forsaken; in that his Father denied to protect and keep him out of the hands of his cruel, bloody, and merciless enemies, no way restraining them, but suffering them to do the uttermost of that their wicked hearts could imagine, and left him to endure the extremity of their fury and malice: and, that nothing might be wanting to make his sorrows beyond measure sorrowful, withdrew from him that solace he was wont to find in God, and removed far from him all things that might any way lessen and assuage the extremity of his pain. So that Christ might rightly complain that he was forsaken, though he were far from despair, and words of despair.

CHAPTER XIX.

OF THE DESCENDING OF CHRIST INTO HELL.

WITH the sufferings of Christ his descension into hell is connexed, both in the order of things and in the Articles of the Creed; and therefore it remaineth that in the next place we speak of that. Bellarmine¹ observeth that the article

¹ "Est autem observandum hanc particulam olim non fuisse in symbolo apud omnes ecclesias. Augustinus, Lib. de Fid. et Symb. et

of Christ's descending into hell was not in the Creed with all Churches from the beginning: for that Irenæus, Origen, and Tertullian have it not; and Augustine in his book *de Fide et Symbolo*, and in his four books *de Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, mentioneth it not, expounding the Creed five times; though elsewhere¹ he say, that none but an infidel will deny the descension of Christ into hell. Ruffinus expoundeth it amongst the Articles of the Creed, but noteth that it is not in the symbol of the Roman Church, nor those of the East. The Nicene Creed hath it not, but that of Athanasius hath, and other of the fathers read it also. And at this day it is received in all the Churches of the world without contradiction, though there be some question touching the meaning of it.

Bellarmino² reckoneth three opinions of Protestants, differently understanding the same: whereof the first is, that to descend into hell is to be utterly annihilated and brought to

4 Lib. de Symb. ad Catech. non meminit hujus partis, cum totum Symbolum quinquies exponat."—Bellarm. De Christi Anima, Lib. iv. cap. 6. [Tom. i. p. 216.]

¹ "Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum."—August. Epist. 99. [Al. Epist. 164. Tom. ii. col. 574, c.]

"Sciendum sane est, quod in ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habetur additum, 'descendit ad inferna:' sed neque in Orientis ecclesiis habetur hic sermo."—Ruffin. Expos. Symbol. [ad calc. Cyprian. p. 22. Oxon. 1682.]

² "Prima sententia est, quod descendere ad inferos sit penitus interire et extinguere. Brentius, in Catech. anni 1551, dicit, descendere ad inferos esse penitus interire. Et in Act. introducit Christum sic loquentem: 'Descendam in infernum, sentiam dolores inferni, et plane periisse videbor.'

"Item Calvinus in Psychopannychia, volens probare animas justorum post discessum a corpore non dormire, id est, non extinguere, ut quidam Anabaptistæ aiunt, quos in toto libro refellit, probat ex anima Christi quæ post separationem a corpore non est extincta nec absorpta a morte, sed immortalis mansit: et hoc dicit significari illis verbis, Act. 2, 'Non derelinques animam in inferno.' 'Hæc nobis,' inquit, 'certissimam fidem faciunt, Christum extinguere morte non potuisse, etiam secundum hominem. Vera mors fuit corporis et animæ solutio, cæterum anima vitam suam nunquam perdidit, quæ Patri commendata non poterat non salva esse. Id volunt verba ex concione Petri, quibus affirmat, impossibile fuisse teneri ipsum a morte, ut scriptura impleretur, 'Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in inferno.' Nam anima ejus divina virtute suffulta est, ne in perditionem rueret, et corpus ejus in sepulchro servatum ad resurrectionem,' &c. . . . Videtur certe hoc loco Calvinus per infernum intelligere perfectam extinctionem animæ;

nothing; the second, that it is to suffer the pains of hell; and the third, that it is nothing else but his burial. Of these three opinions imputed by Bellarmine to the Protestants, the first is nothing but his own fancy, never dreamed of by any Protestant. For who ever professing himself a Christian, thought that to go down into hell is to be utterly extinct, and to be no more? But, saith he, Brentius bringeth in Christ speaking in this sort: "I will descend into hell, I will feel the pains of hell, and seem utterly to perish:" therefore he is of that opinion, whatsoever others are. A strange thing it is that men of learning and judgment should so forget themselves as this cardinal often doth, saying he knoweth not what. For doth he utterly cease to be that feeleth the pains of hell? or do not the wicked perish, and is not their estate in holy scripture described to be everlasting perdition? he knoweth right well it is; and yet, I think, dareth not from thence infer that they are utterly extinct, and have no more being: if he do, we will not fear to brand him with the mark of impiety, and intolerable ignorance; for the wicked are said utterly to perish, not by losing all being, but all good, desirable, and happy being. If Brentius escape his hands, he hath good hope to convince Calvin of this error, and so still to lay upon us the heavy imputation of so damnable impiety. Calvin hath written a book called *Psychopanychia*, the drift whereof is to prove, that the souls and spirits of men sleep not after death, but live, either in pain or rest; out of this book the cardinal presumeth that he shall be able to prove, that the souls and spirits of wicked men are utterly extinct, and have no more being. An ill-chosen book, in my opinion, for such a purpose, the whole drift thereof being to demonstrate the contrary of that he undertaketh to prove out of it. Yet let us see how he goeth about to convince the author of this book of that error, which throughout the same he laboureth to confute. His first demonstration is this. Calvin proveth at large in that book, that the wicked do live for ever, though in pain and torment; therefore he thinketh that to go down into hell is to be utterly extinct, and to have no more being. A strange

probat enim, animam Christi in morte corporis non fuisse extinctam, quia anima ejus non fuit absorpta ab inferno. . . .

"Hæc sententia non eget refutatione; nam est fundamentum atheismi."—Bellarm. De Christi Anima, Lib. iv. cap. 7. [p. 217.]

illation, and such as perhaps will not satisfy all: therefore let us hear another, for he hath store of proofs. Calvin in the same book laboureth to prove that the spirits of just men are not extinguished, but that they live and remain for ever, because that Christ's soul was not extinguished in his death, but remained still, and lived after death. That Christ's soul was not extinguished in his death he strongly demonstrateth, because it was so commended into the hands of his Father, that it could not perish so as the wicked do, who are swallowed up of hell and destruction, and yet still remain and live for ever. If this demonstration satisfy us not, what will? Christ's soul was so kept by God the Father, to whom it was commended, that it could not perish at all, no not so as the wicked do, who yet are not extinct, but live for ever in bitter sense of woe and misery; much less be extinct, and utterly cease to be: therefore Christ's descension into hell was an utter extinction. These must be the cardinal's proofs, if he will bring any out of that book to convince Calvin of that error, wherewith he chargeth him. But he knoweth right well, that neither these, nor any other that he doth or can produce out of the same, conclude any such thing as he intendeth; and therefore let the reader know that the cardinal never persuaded himself, that either Brentius, or Calvin, or any other Protestant, was of that opinion with which he chargeth them; but that he sought only to abuse his reader: and therefore that which in vile hypocrisy he saith of Calvin and Brentius, that they bring in Atheism, by these their impious and damnable assertions, may be verified of himself and other his consorts, who by their shameless lying and hellish slandering wrong both God and men, and bring all religion into horrible contempt. Wherefore, leaving these hellish and devilish slanderers to God's most righteous and fearful judgments; touching the descending of Christ into hell, it is true that St Augustine¹ saith: "None but an infidel will deny it: for it is one of the Articles of our Christian faith:" but how we are to understand this his descending, it is not so certain.

Whereupon we shall find that there are presently three opinions in the Church concerning the same. For some understand by the name of hell the place of dead bodies, and the dominion of death holding soul and body asunder, and turning

¹ August. ubi supra.

the body forsaken of the soul into rottenness and corruption. These do so interpret this Article, as that they understand nothing else by Christ's descending into hell, but his going down into the chambers of death, and his three days' continuance in the places of darkness under the dominion thereof. Others understand by the name of hell the pains of hell, and think that Christ's descending into hell was nothing else but the suffering of hellish pains in his soul, in the time of his agony in the garden, and in the hour of his death upon the cross. A third sort there are that understand by the name of hell, into which (in this Article) Christ is said to have descended, the receptacles and places appointed for the souls of men after this life sequestered from the presence of God, and not admitted into heaven. These places the Romanists imagine to be four. Of which the first is the hell of the damned, wherein wicked cast-aways and impenitent sinners are punished, not only with the loss of the sight of God, but with sense also of smart and misery, and that for ever. The second is by them named *limbus puerorum*, where infants dying unbaptized, and in the state of original sin, are supposed to be holden for ever exiled from the presence of God and his holy ones, yet without all sensible smart or pain. The third (they imagine) is purgatory, where they think the souls of good, but yet imperfect men, are punished till they have satisfied the wrath of God for sins committed in the time of their life, but not sufficiently repented of, nor satisfied for while they lived. The fourth place imagined by them is *limbus patrum*, wherein the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the just were holden till the coming of Christ, and kept from the sight and presence of God, yet without all sensible smart or grief. These being the different mansions of that place, wherein the souls of men are sequestered from the presence of God, comprehended all in a sort under the name of hell, as our adversaries fancy: the ordinary opinion of the school-men heretofore was¹, that Christ's soul went

¹ "Dicendum quod Christus qui est Dei sapientia penetravit omnes inferiores partes terræ, non localiter secundum animam, omnes circum-eundo, sed effectum suæ potentiæ aliquammodo ad omnes extendendo, ita tamen quod solos justos illuminavit, sequitur enim, Et illuminabo omnes sperantes in Domino."—Thomas Aquinas, Summa, Part. III. Quæst. 52. Art. 2. [Tom. iv. fol. 169, Ven. 1594.]

locally only into *limbus patrum*, and not into any of the other mansions of hell, neither *limbus puerorum*, purgatory, nor the lowest hell: but that he descended into these places virtually only, in that he made it appear to all that were in them that the work of Redemption was now wrought, by force whereof they in purgatory after full satisfaction should be received into heaven: the rest, as well in *limbus puerorum*, as in the lowest hell, being excluded from all hope of bettering their estate, and left in endless misery with the devil and his angels. But Bellarmine¹ thinketh he went personally and locally into the place of the damned, even into the lowest hell. These being the diverse and different opinions of men touching the meaning of the article of Christ's descending into hell, let us see what is to be resolved touching the same.

It is true according to the first and second opinion imputed by Bellarmine² unto the Protestants, that Christ dying, after a sort suffered the pains of hell, and being dead, was under the dominion of death three days: yet neither of these interpretations seemeth fitly to agree to the article of our faith; for that the hellish and bitter sufferings of Christ are sufficiently expressed in that he is said to have suffered under Pontius Pilate, to have been crucified, and to have died; and his being under the dominion of death, in that he is said to have been buried. Wherefore the third opinion,

¹ "Probabile est profecto, Christi animam ad omnia inferni loca descendisse. Nam quod B. Thomas respondet, hoc intelligi de penetratione per effectum, non videtur satisfacere."—Bellarm. De Christi Anima, Lib. iv. cap. 16. [p. 231.]

² "Prima sententia est quod descendere ad inferos sit penitus interire et extinguere."—Id. Lib. iv. cap. 7. [p. 216.]

"Altera sententia est ejusdem Calvini, Christum dici descendisse ad inferos quia passus est dolores animarum damnatarum."—Cap. 8. [p. 217.]

"Sequitur tertia explicatio, quæ est Bucer et Beza, intelligi sepulchrum in scripturis nomine inferni, proinde nihil esse aliud Christum descendisse ad inferos, quam sepultum fuisse. Calvinus... in hoc dissentit, quod descensum Christi ad inferos qui ponitur in symbolo non vult esse sepulturam, sed descensum ad pœnas damnatorum. Si quis petat a Calvino et Beza, ubi fuerint ante Christi mortem animæ justorum, respondeat fuisse in cœlo, licet nec viderint Deum nec sint visuræ usque ad diem judicii."—Id. cap. 9. [p. 221.]

which is that he descended into the places of souls sequestered, and shut out from the presence of God, seemeth more truly to express the meaning of this article, not understanding that he went into purgatory, *limbus puerorum*, or *limbus patrum*, but that he descended into the lowest hell. For the three former imagined places are nowhere, and so no part of hell into which Christ descended.

Of Purgatory we find nothing in the Scriptures, or in the writings of the most ancient fathers, as I have elsewhere showed¹. Of *limbus puerorum* we read in Augustine², but confuted and rejected by him as an erroneous conceit of the Pelagians, who imagined a third place between heaven and hell, and a third or middle estate between heaven-happiness and the miseries of the lowest hell, wherein men dying in the state of nature only shall continue for ever deprived of the happiness of seeing God, but no way subjected to sensible smart and grief. Of this it is that St Augustine saith, he hath heard of the right hand and the left; of "Come, ye blessed," and, "Go, ye cursed;" of sheep and goats; of the kingdom of heaven, and hell, where the devil and his angels are everlastingly punished: but of a third estate, of a third sort of men, or of a third place, he hath never heard or read, and therefore is verily persuaded there is no such.

Touching *limbus patrum*, it is true that some amongst the ancient seem to speak of some such thing; but we can-

¹ Book III. ch. 17.

² "Ecce non baptizatus, vitali etiam cibo poculoque privatus, dividitur a regno cœlorum, ubi fons viventium permanet Christus. Da mihi præter hunc alterum locum, ubi vitæ possit requies esse perennis. Primum enim locum fides catholicorum divina auctoritate regnum credit esse cœlorum, unde, ut dixi, non baptizatus excipitur: secundum gehennam, ubi omnis apostata vel a Christi fide alienus æterna supplicia experietur: tertium penitus ignoramus, imo nec esse in scripturis sanctis inveniemus."—August. Hypognosticon, Lib. v. cap. 5. [Tom. x. Append. col. 40.]

"Sicut per unum omnes ad condemnationem, sic per unum omnes ad justificationem. Nec est ullus ulli melius locus, ut possit esse nisi cum diabolo, qui non est cum Christo."—Id. De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione, Lib. i. cap. 28. [Tom. x. col. 30.]

"Nullus relictus est medius locus ubi ponere queas infantes. De vivis et mortuis judicabitur, alii erunt ad dextram, alii ad sinistram; non novi aliud."—Id. Serm. XIV. de Verb. Apost. [Al. Serm. CCXCIV. Tom. v. col. 1184.]

not persuade ourselves that there is any such place, nor that Christ is to be understood to have descended thither, when in the article of the creed he is said to have descended into hell. First, because, as St Augustine¹ fitly noteth, we do not find in the Scripture that the word hell is ever used to express any other place but a place of woe and misery; and therefore so direful a word, used only to note unto us the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, cannot signify that place where the souls of the just did rest till the coming of Christ, named in the parable or history of the rich man and Lazarus, Abraham's bosom. Neither did Augustine ever learn any other lesson afterwards, as some² untruly report that he did. Secondly, because we cannot conceive what Christ did benefit the spirits of the just, abiding in Abraham's bosom, when he went down into hell: *A quibus*, as St Augustine rightly noteth³, *secundum beatificam Divinitatis præsentiam, nunquam recessit, sed quemadmodum apud Tartara semper fuit judicante potentia, ita in paradiso, et sinu Abrahamæ beatificante sapientia*; that is, "from whom according to that presence of his Deity that maketh all them happy that enjoy it, he never departed; but as he was ever present in hell by his power, judging and fastening condemnation to the woeful inhabitants of that place of utter darkness; so he was always in paradise, and in the bosom of Abraham, as that wisdom of God that filleth all with blessedness where it vouchsafeth to manifest itself." Christ therefore descended into hell, according to the article of the creed; into the place of souls sequestered from the presence of God, into the place of damned souls, even into the lowest hell; for there are no souls or spirits of men sequestered from the presence of God, after the separation from the body, but the souls of wicked

¹ "Ne ipsos quidem inferos uspiam scripturarum in bono appellatos potui reperire."—Id. Epist. xcix. [Al. Epist. clxiv. Tom. ii. col. 575, f.]

² "Ut vero nihil de hac Augustini sententia dicam, quæ a pervulgata in omnes opinione desciscere videtur, illud certe tacere non possum, ita hæc, dum quæstionem ventilabat, dixisse, ut absurdum minime judicaverit asserere antiquos sanctos qui venturi Christi tenerunt fidem locis quidem a tormentis impiorum remotissimis sed apud inferos fuisse, donec eos inde sanguis Christi, et illius ad illa loca descensus, erueret."—Jacobus Payva Andradius, Defens. Fid. Trident. Lib. ii. fol. 174, b. [Ingoldst. 1580.]

³ Ubi supra.

castaways ; nor other place of souls so sequestered, but the prison of the lowest hell.

The end of Christ's going and descending into the hell of the damned, was not, as Clemens Alexandrinus¹ and some other did think, to preach unto the damned spirits, and to deliver from thence such as should there believe in him, either all or any. For we must constantly resolve that none were delivered out of hell by Christ's descending, nor none there converted by his preaching; but that his descending was only to fasten condemnation to the devil and his angels, to triumph over the principalities of darkness, to secure us from being surprised by them, and to prevent our coming thither ; not to fetch back any that were there already. The places that are brought to prove that Christ preached in hell, and sought the deliverance either of all, or at the least of some of them he found there, are specially two. The first is that of the apostle St Peter, where he saith, "The gospel was preached to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit²." Here we see the apostle speaketh of preaching unto the dead; but he is to be understood to speak of preaching to the dead³, that is, to such as were dead when he wrote, but not when the gospel was preached unto them: as we say, "Christ shall judge the quick and dead," not as if any should be judged being dead, but because many of them that shall be judged are then dead when we speak of them, though they shall not be when they shall come into judgment: or otherwise, that he speaketh of such as were dead in sin, as some⁴

¹ "Ὁ Κύριος εὐηγγελίστατο καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾗδου. Φησί γ' οὖν ἡ γραφή· Λέγει ὁ ᾄδης τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ· Εἶδος μὲν αὐτοῦ οὐκ εἶδομεν, φωνὴν δὲ αὐτοῦ ἠκούσαμεν. Οὐχ ὁ τόπος δήπου φωνὴν λαβὼν εἶπεν τὰ προειρημένα, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐν ᾗδου καταταγέντες, καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότες, καθάπερ ἕκ τινος νεὼς εἰς θάλασσαν ἐκόντες ἀπορρίψαντες· αὐτοὶ τοίνυν εἰσὶν οἱ ἐπακούσαντες τῆς θείας δυνάμεώς τε καὶ φωνῆς." — Clem. Alex. Stromat. Lib. vi. [cap. 6. p. 762, Oxon. 1715.]

² 1 Pet. iv. 6.

³ "Cum Petrus inquit mortuis fuisse prædicatum evangelium, eos intelligit, qui tunc quidem erant mortui, olim tamen cum viverent evangelium audiverant; ac si diceret, non esse novam illam doctrinam, sed superiorum temporum hominibus jam pridem mortuis annuntiatam."—Andrad. ubi supra, fol. 173.

⁴ "Tanta cura est Deo nos mortificari carne, vivificari spiritu, ut

interpret his words. The second place is of the same apostle, where he saith, that "Christ in spirit went, and preached to the spirits in prison, sometimes disobedient in the days of Noe¹." But, as St Augustine² fitly noteth, this preaching of Christ in spirit mentioned by the apostle was not after his death in his human soul, but in the days of Noe in his eternal spirit and Deity. And, as Andradius³ rightly observeth, they that he preached unto are named spirits in prison, because they were spirits in prison when Peter wrote of them, not when Christ preached to them: though, if they should be understood to be named spirits in prison, as being such when Christ preached unto them, yet we might rightly conceive, as St Augustine doth, that he preached to the souls and spirits of men shut up in the prison-house of their sinful bodies, and the dark dungeons of ignorance and sin, and not in the prison of hell.

Thus then our divines deny the descending of Christ into purgatory, *limbus puerorum*, and *limbus patrum*, persuading themselves that there are no such places. But his descending into the hell of the damned they all acknowledge, though not to deliver men thence, yet to fasten condemnation to them that

his quoque qui majoribus criminibus involuti inter mortuos erant numerandi verbum fidei evangelizare præceperit, ut judicentur, i. e. condemnentur a seipsis."—Gloss. Ordin. ad loc.

"'Mortuis,' i. e. Infidelibus, secundum illud Matt. 'Dimitte mortuos sepelire mortuos suos.'"—Lyra, in. loc. [Biblia Vulgata, cum glossa et postillis Nicolai de Lyra, Tom. vi. col. 1335, Antv. 1634.]

¹ 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20.

² "Nondum venerat scilicet in carne sicut venit quando post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est. Veruntamen ab initio generis humani, vel ad arguendos malos sicut ad Cain, et prius ad ipsum Adam uxoremque ejus, vel ad consolandos bonos, vel ad utrosque admonendos, ut alii ad salutem suam crederent, alii ad pœnam suam non crederent, ipse utique non in carne sed in spiritu veniebat, visis congruis adloquens quos volebat, sicut volebat. Quod autem dixi, 'in spiritu veniebat,' et ipse quidem Filius in substantia Deitatis, quoniam corpus non est, utique spiritus est."—August. Epist. xcix. [Al. Epist. CLXIV. Tom. ii. col. 579.]

³ "Eorundem mentes potius intelligo quos Noe admonere nunquam intermisit, inferni quidem jam Petri ætate carceribus inclusas, funestissimisque illis atque horrificis vinculis detentas; quibus Christum inquit tunc spiritu prædicasse, cum essent corporibus inclusæ, et vita mortali fruerentur, salutisque adhuc spes aliqua illis emeretur."—Andradius, ubi supra, fol. 172.

are there; to bind Satan the prince of darkness, that he may not prevail against them that believe in Christ; and to keep them from sinking down into that devouring pit into which he went, and out of which he so triumphantly returned. Only this difference may seem to be amongst them, that some of them think he went personally and locally, others, only virtually, in power and operation. Which diversity of opinions is likewise amongst the papists; Bellarmine, and some other in our time, teaching that he went locally into the lowest hell; and the schoolmen, that he went not locally into the lowest hell, but virtually only in the manifestation of his virtue and power, and into *limbus patrum* locally and personally: so that all the controversy between them and us standeth in two points, the descending of Christ into *limbus patrum*, and the suffering of hellish pains. For whereas cardinal Bellarmine¹ laboureth to prove a local hell, he busieth himself in vain, no man denying it: "But," saith he, "Beza, and others do say, the words used in the Hebrew and Greek, *Sheol* and *ᾗδης*, do always signify the grave in holy Scripture, and not hell; whence it may seem to follow that there is no other hell than the grave, and so consequently no local hell for damned souls." Surely this is a most unjust and untrue imputation. For Beza, and the other learned divines he speaketh of, do not affirm that *Sheol* and *ᾗδης* do precisely and always in holy Scripture signify the grave, but, as Arias Montanus², Andradius³, and sundry other excellently learned amongst our ad-

¹ "Jam vero nomen Hebræum, quod habetur passim in testamento veteri, est *הֵינֶשׁ*, quod verbum contendit Beza ubique accipi pro sepulchro; sed falsum est, nam significat voraginem, et ordinarie accipitur pro loco animarum subterraneo, et vel raro vel nunquam pro sepulchro."—Bellarm. De Christi Anima, Lib. iv. cap. 10. [Tom. i. p. 221].

² "Hebraice *הֵינֶשׁ* dicitur, quod semper petere et accipere soleat, sponte autem edere quicquam aut excepta reddere non cupiat. Ex quo fit, ut omnis hominum de vita hac mortali excedentium status, inferni nomine sæpe in sacris libris indicetur, præsertim ubi sermo antiqua ante evangelium promulgatum tempora spectet."—Arias Montanus, De arcano Sermone, cap. 21. [p. 30, Antv. 1572.]

³ "Facile adducor ut credam Græcos olim codices pro *θανάτου* habuisse *ᾗδου*, id est, inferni; quamvis nullum erit inter Latina Græcaque exemplaria dissidium; si animadvertamus infernum hoc loco pro morte atque sepulchro, Hebræorum dicendi more, usurpari."—Andrad. ubi supra, fol. 174.

versaries do, that *Sheol*, which the Septuagint translate *ᾗδης*, doth not precisely and immediately signify the place of damned souls, but, in an indifferency and generality of signification, noteth out unto us the receptacles of the dead: and that, seeing there are two parts that are sundered one from another in them that are dead, there are likewise two kinds of receptacles of death or dwellingplaces for them on whom death hath her full force; the one provided for their bodies putrefying and rotting, and the other for their souls tormented everlastingly. So that when these words, thus indifferently signifying either of these receptacles of death, do note out unto us the one or the other of these two places, either the grave for the body, or hell for the soul, cannot be gathered out of the words themselves, but the circumstances of those places of Scripture where they are used. In like sort, they say that the word *Nephesh*, translated *ψυχή* and *anima*, doth not always signify the spiritual substance of man that is immortal, but the whole person, the life, yea, and sometimes that which hath been alive though now dead, even a dead carcase: according as we read in Leviticus, where God pronounceth that whosoever toucheth *Nephesh*¹, that is, a dead corpse, shall be unclean. And in this sense it is that Arias Montanus² translateth not that place in the Psalm³, *Non derelinques animam meam in inferno*, that is, “Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell;” but, *Non derelinques animam meam in sepulchro*; that is, “Thou shalt not leave my soul, life, or person, or that body that sometimes was alive, in the grave.” For it cannot be understood that the reasonable soul, or immortal spirit of Christ, was ever in the grave, either to be delivered thence or left there. If it be said that the Greek and Latin words used by the translators signify more precisely hell, and the reasonable soul or spirit, than those Hebrew words *Sheol* and *Nephesh* do, we answer, that whatsoever their use and signification be in profane authors, yet they must be enlarged in the Scriptures, to signify all that which the Hebrew words do, that so the translation may be true and full. Bellarmine⁴, to confute

¹ Levit. xxi. 2. Numb. xix. 11.

² Version. Interlinear. in Bibliis Regiis. [p. 49. Antv. 1572.]

³ Ps. xvi. 11.

⁴ “Huc accedit consensus fere omnium illorum qui de hac re judicare poterant. Nam LXX. seniores *שְׁאוֹל*, ubique verterunt *ᾗδης*,

this explication and construction of the Hebrew words made by Beza and the rest, urgeth that the Septuagint never translateth *Sheol* by *τάφος*, which properly signifies the grave, but by *ᾠδης*; and that therefore *Sheol* doth not properly signify the grave. Hereunto we answer, that the word of itself being indifferent to signify any receptacles of the dead, whether of their bodies or souls, must not be translated by a word precisely noting the grave, as *τάφος* doth; and that therefore it is not to be marvelled at that the Septuagint never translate the Hebrew word by this Greek word of a narrower compass, and straiter signification. Secondly, we say, that seeing *Sheol*, when (by the circumstances of the places where it is used) it is restrained to signify only the place of dead bodies, yet doth not precisely note that fitting receptacle provided for them to be laid in, as in their beds of rest, by the living, as *τάφος* doth, but any other receptacle whatsoever, even of such as want that honourable kind of burial, whether they be devoured by wild beasts, swallowed up of the sea, or received into any other place of stay and abode, till the time of the general resurrection, the translators used not the word *τάφος*, of too narrow compass and strait signification, but the word *ᾠδης*, enlarged by them to express all that the Hebrew word importeth: and in this sense Jacob¹ said he would go down mourning into *Sheol* or *ᾠδης* to his son, not into a place of souls sequestered from God, or into hell, for he never thought his son to be gone thither, nor into the grave properly so named, for he thought his son had been devoured of a wild beast; but into the receptacles of the dead, and into the chambers of death, wherein there are many and very different mansions. The words of this holy patriarch, professing that he would go down mourning to his son into *Sheol* or *ᾠδης*, and not observing of this generality of signification of the word *Sheol*, but restraining it to note only the receptacles of the damned spirits, gave occasion to some for to think that the souls of the just were in some part of hell, or at least in some invisible place far from heaven, and within the confines of hell, till the resurrection of Christ, if not till the general resurrection, and his return to judge both the quick and dead;

nusquam *τάφος*.”—Bellarm. De Christi Anima, Lib. iv. cap. 10. [p. 222.]

¹ Gen. xxxvii. 35.

as Irenæus¹, Tertullian², and others imagined. But howsoever the Greek or Latin words may seem to be restrained to note only the places of damned spirits, yet it is plain and evident that the Hebrew word *Sheol* signifieth any devouring gulf or pit, swallowing up the dead, in that Kore, Dathan, and Abiram³, with their wives, children, cattle, tents, and all that ever they had, went down into *Sheol*; which cannot be understood to be precisely the place of the damned spirits, unless we will imagine that sheep, oxen, and tents, may find any place amongst the damned spirits.

The reason why our divines do so much urge the generality of the signification of this word, and will not suffer it to be restrained to signify only the place of damned spirits, is, because the propriety of the word admitteth no restraint, and there are many things in Scripture said to go down into *Sheol*, or to be in *Sheol*, that cannot be understood to have gone into hell, or to be in hell; and not for that they deny Christ's descending into the hell of the damned, for there is no Protestant but confesseth that Christ did virtually descend into hell, and many think he descended locally and personally: which difference of opinions is also amongst the Papists. For Durandus⁴ thinketh that Christ descended into no part of hell per-

¹ “Αἱ ψυχὰὶ ἀπέρχονται εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ὁρισμένον αὐταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ κεῖ μέχρι τῆς ἀναστάσεως φοιτῶσι, περιμένουσαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν· ἔπειτα ἀπολαβοῦσαι τὰ σώματα, καὶ ὁλοκλήρως ἀναστᾶσαι, τουτέστι σωματικῶς, καθὰς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀνέστη, οὕτως ἐλεύσονται εἰς τὴν ὥσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ.”—Iren. contr. Hæres. Lib. v. [cap. 31. p. 452, Oxon. 1702.]

² “Quod si Christus Deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum scripturas et sepultus secus easdem, huic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora cœlorum quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic patriarchas et prophetas compotes sui faceret, habes et regionem inferum subterraneam credere, et illos cubito pellere, qui satis superbe non putant animas fidelium inferis dignas, servi super dominum et discipuli super magistrum, aspernati si forte in Abrahæ sinu expectandæ resurrectionis solatium capere.”—Tertull. De Anima. [cap. 55. p. 304, Lut. Par. 1675.]

³ Numb. xvi. 33.

⁴ “Alio modo potest dici anima separata descendere ad infernum, secundum effectum, et hoc modo potest dici anima Christi descendisse ad infernum propter duplicem effectum quem habuit in illis qui erant in inferno.”—Durandus a Sancto Portiano, in 3 Sent. Dist. xxii. Quæst. 3. [fol. 215, Par. 1550.]

sonally, or locally, but virtually only. The rest¹ of the schoolmen for the most part suppose that he descended locally into that part of hell which they call *limbus patrum*, but into the hell of the damned, and the other infernal mansions, virtually only. But Bellarmine² thinketh he went locally into the lowest hell, or hell of the damned, moved so to think, as he saith, by the authority of the fathers, that seem to have been of that opinion. So that, as I said before, the only difference between the Romanists and our divines about the descending of Christ into hell, is touching the suffering of hellish pains, (whereof I have spoken at large before, clearing the opinions of our divines in such sort, as I think our adversaries will not much resist against the same so understood as I have showed they must be,) and touching *limbus patrum*. Wherefore let us proceed to take a view of the proofs they bring for confirmation of their *limbus*.

The first place that Bellarmine bringeth for confirmation thereof is that in Genesis, where Jacob saith, "I will descend or go down mourning to my son into *Sheol*³." "See," saith Bellarmine⁴, "Jacob was a godly man, and so was Joseph,

¹ "Respondeo dicendum quod dupliciter dicitur esse aliquid alicubi. Uno modo per suum effectum, et hoc modo Christus in quemlibet infernorum descendit. . . . Alio modo dicitur aliquid esse alicubi per suam essentiam, et hoc modo anima Christi descendit solum ad locum inferni in quo justi detinebantur, ut quos ipse per gratiam interius visitabat secundum divinitatem, eos etiam secundum animam visitaret et loco. Sic autem in una parte inferni existens effectum suum aliquo modo ad omnes inferni partes derivavit."—Thomas Aquinas, Summa, Part. III. Quæst. 52. Art. 2. [Tom. IV. fol. 168, B. Ven. 1594.]

² "Probabile est profecto, Christi animam ad omnia loca inferni descendisse."—Bellarm. De Christi Anima, Lib. IV. cap. 16. [p. 230.]

³ Gen. xxxvii. 35.

⁴ "Quantum ad secundum, quod animæ piorum non fuerint in cœlo ante Christi ascensionem, probatur primo, quia est ea sententia prorsus inaudita in ecclesia Dei; id quod sane deberet sufficere ad refutationem. Præterea Genes. xxxvii. Jacob ait: 'Descendam ad filium meum in infernum.' Pius erat Jacob, pius etiam Joseph, et tamen utrumque non ascendisse ad cœlum, sed ad inferos descendisse scriptura significat. Item Luc. xvi. dives in inferno cum esset, vidit a longe animam Lazari in sinu Abrahæ, et audivit, inter loca ipsorum magnum hiatus esse, id enim significat χάσμα: ex quo apparet nihil solidi fuisse interjectum inter locum damnatorum et sinum Abrahæ, sed utrasque animas in eadem voragine fuisse, licet multum inter se dis-

and yet neither of them went up into heaven, but both descended into hell." That they descended into *Sheol*, that is, into the chambers of death, and receptacles of dead bodies, we make no question; but that they went into the hell of the damned, or into any region of darkness near unto it, cannot be proved; howsoever some amongst the ancient, deceived by the Greek and Latin word *ᾗδης* and *infernus*, used by the translators to express the force of the Hebrew word *Sheol*, have so thought. The second proof that he bringeth is this: "Abraham in the gospel telleth the rich man in hell, that between them there is *χάσμα*¹, which signifieth such a separation as is by the rending of the earth, and dividing of one part thereof from another; therefore there is no solid thing between them, and consequently, they were all in the same devouring gulf or pit." But this surely is a strange kind of proof; for his own friends and followers understand by this *χάσμα*, the immoveable decree of God, who will never suffer the one to pass to the other, and not literally such a void, empty, and gaping distance, as the word doth properly signify. Yea, Maldonatus² is so far from being persuaded by the bare signification of this one word, that Abraham and Lazarus were in the same devouring gulf with the rich man, that he saith: "The place Abraham speaketh of, between which and hell there is so great a distance, is heaven." Whereunto Augustine seemeth in part to consent, who pronounceth³ that he could never find that Abraham's bosom, wherein Lazarus rested, was any part of hell. Wherefore it is absurd to imagine, upon the bare and only signification of the word *χάσμα*, that Abraham, and the rich man in hell,

tantes. Item lib. I Reg. cap. 28, anima Samuelis apparens Sauli de terra ascendere visa est."—Id. cap. 11. [p. 222.]

¹ Luke xvi. 26.

² "Quin valde suspicor summum hic cœlum designari, inter quod et infimum damnatorum locum ubi dives erat magnus utique erat hiatus, totum scilicet spatium aëris, quod quasi hiatus quidam vacuum et impermeabile videtur esse."—Maldonat. in loc. [col. 298, Mogunt. 1596.]

³ "Ne ipsos quidem inferos uspiam scripturarum in bono appellatos potui reperire. Quod si nusquam in divinis auctoritatibus legitur, non utique sinus ille Abrahæ, id est secretæ cujusdam quietis habitatio, aliqua pars inferorum esse credenda est."—August. Ep. 99. [Al. Ep. 164. Tom. II. col. 575.]

were in the same pit, divided only by an empty gulf between them; seeing Tertullian¹, a very ancient writer, that knew the force of this word as well as Bellarmine, affirmeth, notwithstanding anything that may be inferred from thence, that Abraham's bosom is on high, far above those infernal dwellings of the damned. Whereunto that in the Proverbs agreeth, "The way of life is on high to the prudent, to avoid from hell beneath²."

The next place that the Jesuit bringeth to prove *limbus*, is that of Samuel³, whom the Pythoness raised, when Saul consulted her, being destitute of other means of direction. But this place of all other maketh least to the purpose, it being very doubtful whether it were true Samuel that appeared, or Satan taking unto him a body, and coming forth in the likeness of Samuel. But let us suppose it was true Samuel: could not his soul return from some other place as well as out of *limbus*? No doubt it might; and that which Bellarmine hath, that the soul of Samuel appearing unto Saul, seemed to come out of the earth, and consequently out of *limbus*, is a very silly conceit; for what eye could see and discern Samuel's soul? "But," saith he, "Samuel appearing told Saul, a wicked and godless man, that he should be with him very shortly; therefore he was in some region of hell, and not in heaven; seeing this wicked king could not go to him into heaven." We need not seek far for answer to this objection; for the ordinary gloss⁴ doth excellently answer it, saying, that "if these were not the words of a lying spirit, they may be understood in respect of the common condition of death, not in respect of the same place, there being so

¹ "Eam itaque regionem, sinum dico Abrahamæ, etsi non cœlestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat."—Tertull. Advers. Marcion. Lib. iv. [cap. 34. p. 450.]

² Prov. xv. 24.

³ 1 Sam. xxviii.

⁴ "Forte illa imago dixit secum Saulem futurum quod est falsum. Inter bonos enim et malos post mortem chaos magnum firmatum est. Vel propterea dixit 'mecum eris,' ut ad parem conditionem mortis referatur: quia uterque homo fuerit, et mori potuerit; jam mortuus mortem vivo prænuntiavit."—Gloss. Ordin. in hunc locum. [Biblia Sacra cum Gloss. Ordin. &c. Tom. ii. col. 497, Antv. 1634.]

great a distance between them, and so surely settled and established."

Touching this appearing Samuel I find great difference of opinions amongst divines; some thinking it was true Samuel the man of God, others, a lying spirit in his likeness. Lyra¹,

¹ "Quæritur utrum in tali suscitatione apparuit ipse Samuel, vel malignus spiritus in ejus specie. Et arguitur primo quod fuerit ipse Samuel: quia scriptura hic de ipso loquitur tanquam de persona ipsius, nominans ipsam pluries proprio nomine; et ideo videretur falsitatem prætere neri nisi ipse fuisset. Item magna irreverentia facta fuisset sancto, si malignus spiritus toties in scriptura nominatus fuisset nomine ipsius. Item Eccl. xvi. dicitur de ipso: 'Et post hoc dormivit et notum fecit regi, et ostendit illi finem vitæ suæ, &c.' Item dicit certitudinaliter verum de futuris contingentibus, scilicet de morte Saul et filiorum ejus, et de debellatione sui exercitus, et videtur fuisse verus propheta Samuel, et non malignus spiritus, qui est mendax et pater mendacii, ut habetur Joan. viii.

"In contrarium arguitur per glossam quæ habetur Esa. xxix. quæ dicit sic: 'Pythonissa non suscitavit Samuelem, sed evocavit dæmonem.' Item Deus nolebat respondere Sauli per prophetas vivos, ut patet ex prædictis: et multo minus per mortuos, ut videtur. Item ille qui apparuit dixit Sauli, 'Cras mecum eris.' Cum igitur Saul esset reprobatus, et igne gehennæ cruciandus, videtur quod ille qui sibi apparuit malignus spiritus fuerit eidem igni deputatus. Item ille qui apparuit permisit se adorari a Saule, quod non permisisset sanctus Samuel, cum solus Deus sit adorandus; et ideo videtur quod fuerit malignus spiritus talis honoris cupidus. Item si fuit Samuel, aut apparuit divina virtute, vel magica. Non primo modo, quia sic Deus multum favisset arti magicæ, faciens apparere Samuelem ad invocationem Pythonissæ, quod omnino videtur falsum et irrationabile. Nec secundo modo, quia ars magica nullam virtutem habet de se, sed dæmones per aliqua pacta cum magis inita, voluntarie apparent vel aliqua faciunt, ut homines teneant in errore. Si igitur Samuel virtute magica apparuit hoc fuit quia dæmon ipse adduxit. Tunc quæritur, aut fuit adductus voluntarie, et sic dæmoni consensit in malo actu, quod est inconveniens, cum esset in parte sanctorum; aut coactus per dæmonem, et hoc videtur inconveniens, quia dæmones super sanctos defunctos nullam habent potestatem. . . . Adducit etiam ad hoc Augustinus aliquas rationes tactas in arguendo pro parte ista; et ad hoc videtur magis declinare agens de præstigiis dæmonum, ut habetur in decretis. Dicendum igitur quod si decretum allegatum habeatur pro determinatione ecclesiæ, tenenda est ista pars determinate. Si autem non sit determinatio ecclesiæ; ut probabiliter videtur, tum quia Augustinus cujus est decretum utrumque modum dicendi ponit ut probabilem et rationabilem in epistola ad Simplicianum, tum quia post compilationem decretorum expositores sacræ scripturæ prædictos modos recitaverunt et scripserunt tanquam

in his annotations upon the First of Kings, chap. xxviii., putteth down the reasons brought on both sides; and first, that it was the true Samuel, he showeth that these reasons are commonly brought. First, because the Scripture speaketh of him as of his very person, not of any counterfeit likeness of him, calling him not once, but often, by the name of Samuel. Secondly, for that it had been a great dishonour and irreverence offered to Samuel, if so often the devil should have been called by his name in holy Scripture. Lastly, for that it is said in Ecclesiasticus, in the praise of Samuel the prophet of God¹, that he prophesied after his death, that he afterwards slept again, and that he made known to king Saul his end, and the overthrow of his armies; which prediction is not to be imputed to a lying spirit, seeing he so certainly foretold what was to come to pass. On the other side, he produceth these proofs. First, the gloss upon the twenty-ninth of Esay saith, the pythoness did not raise Samuel, but evocated and called out the devil in his likeness. Secondly, it is not likely, that God, who would not answer Saul by living prophets, would send any from the dead to advise or direct him. Thirdly, he that appeared unto Saul said unto him, “to-morrow thou shalt be with me;” but Saul as a wicked man was to be in hell the place of torments: therefore he that appeared was so. Fourthly, he that appeared suffered Saul to worship him, which true Samuel would not have done, seeing God only is to be worshipped. Fifthly, if it were true Samuel that appeared, either he was raised by divine power, or by the power of magical incantations: if by divine power, God should very much have favoured magical arts, if at the invocation of this pythoness he had wrought such a miracle; if by the power of magic, then was he raised by the devil; and that either with his consent, and then he had done evil, which he could not do; or without his consent, which could not be,

probabiles et rationabiles, quod non fecissent si unus dicendi modus esset ab ecclesia determinatus, nisi forsan ex ignorantia hujus determinationis, quod non videtur eis imputandum, et ideo si illud decretum non sit determinatio ecclesiæ, videtur, absque tamen assertione, quod probabilior sit modus dicendi, quod anima Samuelis virtute divina et ejus dispensatione apparuerit modo prædicto ad annuntiandam Sauli divinam sententiam.—Lyra in 1 Reg. xxviii. [Tom. II. col. 494.]

¹ Ecclus. xlvi. 20.

seeing the devil hath no power to force the saints of God after their death and departure hence. Lastly, he allegeth the authority of Augustine¹, who bringing the reasons on both sides, in the end inclineth rather to this latter opinion: and that in the *Decrees*², *Cap. Nec mirum &c.* adding, that if that decree taken out of Augustine be the decree of the Church, no man may think otherwise: but if it be not (as he thinketh it is not, because Augustine, out of whom it was taken, disputeth the matter doubtfully, and many of the divines since the compiling of that decree, are of another opinion, which they ought not to be, if it were the decree of the Church), he rather thinketh it was true Samuel that appeared, than any counterfeit in his likeness. If any man desire to see the different opinions of the fathers touching this point, let him read Tertullian in his book *de Anima*, the thirty-third chapter, and the annotations upon the same place of Tertullian. But howsoever, whether it were true Samuel that appeared unto Saul, or a counterfeit in his likeness, I hope it is clear and evident out of that which hath been said, that this apparition no way proveth the imagined *limbus* of the Papists.

There remain yet two other places of Scripture to be examined, that are brought for confirmation of the same, but yielding as little proof as this. The one is in the prophecies of Zacharie, the other in the Epistle of St. Peter. The words in the former place according to the vulgar translation³ are these: “Thou in the blood of thy testament hast delivered thy prisoners out of the lake wherein there is no water⁴.” But in the original the words are otherwise⁵, and Arias Montanus⁶ translateth the place otherwise in this sort: “And thou,” to wit, “Jerusalem, in the blood of thy testament,”

¹ August. Epist. ad Simplicianum. [De Diversis Quæstionibus ad Simplicianum, Lib. II. Quæst. 3. Tom. VI. col. 115.]

² Part. 2. Caus. xxvi. Quæst. 5. Cap. ‘Nec mirum.’ [Col. 1815. Par. 1585.]

³ [“Tu vero in sanguine testamenti tui emisisti vinctos tuos de lacu in quo non est aqua.”—Vulg.]

⁴ Zech. ix. 11.

⁵ [גַּם-אַתָּה בְּדַם-בְּרִיתְךָ שִׁלַּחְתִּי אֲסִירֶיךָ מִבּוֹר אֵין מַיִם בּוֹ:]

⁶ “Etiam tu Jerusalem exulta in sanguine fœderis tui. Emisi vinctos tuos de cisterna in qua non erat aqua.”—Arias Montanus, in Versione Interlineari. [p. 162, Antv. 1571.]

that is, sprinkled with the blood of thy testament, "rejoice and be glad; I have dismissed thy prisoners out of the lake wherein there is no water." So that these words, "Thou in the blood of thy testament," are not applicable unto Christ, but to Jerusalem; and the other, touching the dismissing of the prisoners out of the lake wherein is no water, unto God the Father, who speaketh in this place to Jerusalem, concerning Christ her King, and comforteth her, saying: "Rejoice, O daughter of Sion: be glad, O daughter of Jerusalem; for, behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and riding on an ass used to the yoke, and the foal of an ass. I will destroy the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem: he shall destroy the bows of the fighters, and the multitude, and publish peace to the nations. He shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the land; and thou," to wit, "Jerusalem, in the blood of thy testament," that is, sprinkled with the blood of thy testament, "rejoice and be glad. I have dismissed thy prisoners out of the lake wherein there is no water." Thus we see this place, according to the original verity, and the translation of Arias Montanus, maketh nothing for the confirmation of that for proof whereof it is brought. Yea, though we should follow the vulgar translation, and take the words to be spoken by Almighty God to Christ his Son, yet could not our adversaries prove *limbus* out of this place. For the author of the gloss¹, and many other², following the vulgar translation, understand these words of the deliverance of the people of God out of the captivity of Babylon, which was as a deep pit, having in it no water, but mire wherein their feet stuck fast. And Hierome³ himself, though he un-

¹ ["'Tu vero,' O Christe fili, 'in sanguine' passionis tuæ eos qui tenebantur vincti in carceribus inferni, in quo non est ulla refrigerans misericordia, quam dives quærebat, liberasti tua misericordia."—Gloss. Interlin.]

² ["Judæi ita dicunt: O Christe, quem expectamus venturum, qui regnaturus es in omni terra, 'in sang. test. tui,' hostiarum scilicet, qui ex præcepto legis præcipiebantur offerri, in qua lege testabaris bona danda filiis tuis, emisisti Israel populum tuum 'de lacu' captivitatis Chaldæorum, in quibus nulla misericordia."—Gloss. Ordin. in loc. ex Hieron.]

³ "Deus Pater omnipotens. . . . facit apostrophum ad ipsum Christum; . . . quod ita intelligitur: 'In sanguine passionis tuæ eos qui

derstand the words of Christ's descending into hell, yet mentioneth the other interpretation also in the same place, not much disliking it. Neither doth his interpretation of Christ's descending into hell prove *limbus*. For he speaketh of the prison of hell, where is no mercy, and calleth it a cruel or fearful hell; and not of *limbus patrum*, or Abraham's bosom. Bellarmine¹ cunningly after his manner, to discredit our interpretation of deliverance out of Babylonical captivity, maketh as if Calvin only had expounded the words of the holy prophet in that sort; whereas yet many excellent divines, long before Calvin was born, interpreted them in the very same sort as we do. But if the challenge of novelty fail, he betaketh himself to another of absurdity and improbability, pronouncing that our interpretation hath no probability: first, because in the words immediately going before, there is a prophecy concerning Christ, uttered unto Jerusalem in these words: "Rejoice, O daughter of Sion, for behold thy King cometh, &c.:" which the evangelists expound of Christ's coming into Jerusalem; and then secondly, an apostrophe to Christ in the words questioned. But first herein he is deceived: for the speech of Almighty God to his Church, begun in the former words, is still continued in these, showing what favours for Christ's sake he had, and still meant to bestow on her: whereas according to the translation they follow, there is first a speech directed to the Church concerning Christ, then an apostrophe to Christ, and then thirdly, a return unto the Church again. Secondly, if that were granted which he

vincti in carcere tenebantur inferni, in quo non est ulla misericordia, tua clementia liberasti.'

"Rursumque ad ipsos qui vincti erant, et Christi misericordia liberandi, sermo dirigitur: 'Convertimini ad munitionem vincti spei.' Et est sensus: 'Qui nunc vincti estis et immiti atque terribili inferno tenemini, qui solutionem vinculorum in Christi speratis adventu, convertimini ad munitionem, sive sedebitis in munitione.'"—Hieron. in loc. [Tom. vi. col. 864, Veron. 1736.]

¹ "Quod autem Calvinus dicit a Zacharia vocari lacum sine aqua profunditatem Babylonicæ captivitatis, unde liberati fuerunt Judæi, nullam habet probabilitatem. Nam in versibus præcedentibus ponitur vaticinium de Christo, 'Exulta filia Sion, ecce rex tuus venit tibi, &c.' Quod evangelistæ de Christi ingressu in Hierosolymam exposuerunt, et inde fit apostrophe ad ipsum Christum."—[Bellarm. De Anima Christi, Lib. iv. cap. 11. Tom. i. p. 223.]

urgeth touching the supposed apostrophe, it would not prove that there is no probability in our interpretation; for this consequence will never be made good in the schools: Christ is prophesied of in the words immediately going before, and in these words God speaketh unto him by way of apostrophe; therefore they cannot be understood of deliverance out of Babylonical captivity; seeing it is certain that Christ delivered the Israelites out of all the miseries out of which they escaped. “But,” saith Bellarmine, “if we admit this interpretation, in what blood of the covenant may we understand the Jews to have been delivered out of Babylonical captivity?” Surely, this question is soon answered: for their deliverance out of the hands of their enemies, and all other benefits, were bestowed on them by virtue of the covenant between God and them, which was to be established in the blood of Christ; in figure whereof, all holy things among the Jews were sprinkled with blood, as the book of the covenant, the altar, the sanctuary, and people.

Wherefore seeing this place maketh nothing for the confirmation of the popish error touching *limbus*, let us come to the last place brought for proof thereof, which is that of St Peter¹ concerning Christ’s going in spirit, and preaching to the spirits in prison; and see whether from thence it may be proved any better. St Augustine² understandeth the words of the apostle, as I noted before, of Christ’s preaching in the days of Noe, in his eternal Spirit of Deity, and not of preaching in hell, in his human soul after death: but this interpretation of St Augustine, first Bellarmine³ rejecteth as contrary to the fathers; and secondly, endeavoureth to improve it by weakening the reasons brought to confirm it, and by opposing certain reasons against it. The first of the fathers that he allegeth is Clemens Alexandrinus⁴, who indeed understandeth

¹ 1 Pet. i. 19, 20.

² Epist. 99. [p. 114. not. 2. supra.]

³ “Ipso non solum permittente, sed etiam cupiente Augustino, hanc expositionem primam breviter refellemus. Primo, non placet hæc sententia, quia communis patrum est in contrarium. Nam Clemens Alexandrinus, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Cyrillus, Hilarius, Ambrosius, Œcumenius, exponunt de descensu Christi ad inferos, ubi spiritus defunctorum degere existimantur.”—Bellarm. [De Anima Christi, Lib. iv. cap. 13, p. 225.]

⁴ “Ὁ Κύριος εὐηγγελίσατο καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾗδου. Φησί γ’ οὖν ἡ γραφή· Λέγει ὁ ᾄδης τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ· Εἶδος μὲν αὐτοῦ οὐκ εἶδομεν, φωνὴν δὲ αὐτοῦ

the words of St Peter, not as St Augustine doth, but of Christ preaching in hell after his death in his human soul; but, not conceiving to what purpose preaching should serve in hell, if there were not intended a conversion and saving of some there, he runneth into a most gross and dangerous error, condemned and rejected as well by Bellarmine and his companions, as by us: so that his authority, as contrary to Augustine's interpretation, needed not to have been alleged, nor would not have been, if Bellarmine had meant sincerely. For Clemens Alexandrinus affirmeth, as he well knoweth, that so many infidels as believed in Christ, and listened to the words of his preaching when he came into hell, were delivered thence, and made partakers of everlasting salvation: against which error, himself being judge, St Augustine not without good cause disputeth in his epistle to Evodius¹. The second ancient writer that he produceth for proof of Christ's preaching in hell after his death is Athanasius², who indeed doth expound the words of Peter, of Christ's going in soul to preach in hell after his death, but no way expresseth in what sort, to whom, to what purpose, or with what success he preached. Epiphanius³, whom he produceth in the third place, doth not so interpret the words of Peter himself; but only upon another occasion citeth the epistle of Athanasius to Epictetus, wherein he doth so interpret them. So that the authority of Epiphanius might have been spared. Ruffinus⁴,

ἠκούσαμεν. Οὐκ ὁ τόπος δήπου φωνὴν λαβὼν εἶπεν τὰ προειρημένα, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐν ᾄδου καταταγέντες, καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότες, καθάπερ ἔκ τινος νεῶς εἰς θάλασσαν ἐκόντες ἀπορρίψαντες, αὐτοὶ τοίνυν εἰσὶν οἱ ἐπακούσαντες τῆς θείας δυνάμεως τε καὶ φωνῆς."—Clem. Alex. Strom. Lib. vi. [cap. 6. p. 762, Oxon. 1715]

¹ "Quadam indole animi ita delectant, ut eos in quibus hæc fuerunt, vellemus vel præcipue, vel cum cæteris ab inferni cruciatibus liberari, nisi aliter se haberet sensus humanus et aliter justitia Creatoris, &c."—[August. Epist. CLXIV. Tom. II. col. 574.]

² "Τοῦτο (τὸ σῶμα) ἦν τὸ ἐν μνημείῳ τεθὲν, ὅτε αὐτὸς ἐπορεύθη, μὴ χωρισθεὶς αὐτοῦ κηρύξαι καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος."—Athanas. Epist. ad Epictet. [Tom. I. p. 905, c. Par. 1698.]

³ Epiphanius, Hæres. LXXVII. [Tom. I. p. 1002, A. Colon. 1682.]

⁴ "Et Petrus dixit: 'Quia Christus mortificatus carne vivificatus spiritu. In ipso,' ait, 'eis qui in carcere inclusi erant, descendit spiritibus prædicare, qui increduli fuere in diebus Noe,' in quo etiam quid operis egerit in inferno declaratur."—[Ruffin. Expos. Symbol. ad calc. Cyprian. p. 24, Oxon. 1682.]

in his explication of the Creed, interpreteth the words of Peter as Athanasius doth. Cyril¹, in the place cited by Bellarmine, speaketh of Christ's preaching to the spirits in hell, but saith nothing in particular of this place of Peter. St Ambrose² doth not speak of this place, but that other of preaching the gospel to the dead. So that there are no more ancient writers cited by Bellarmine, that do precisely interpret this place of Peter, of Christ's preaching in hell in his human soul after death, but only Clemens, Athanasius, Ruffinus, and Œcumenius. On the other side we have St Augustine, Beda, the authors of the ordinary and interlineal glosses, Lyra, Hugo Cardinalis, and other, interpreting the words as we do: so that our adversaries have no great advantage in respect of the number of interpreters; and yet if they had, it would not help them for confirmation of their supposed *limbus*, seeing some of the fathers cited by him, as namely Clemens Alexandrinus, speak directly of preaching in the lowest hell, for the conversion of infidels; which they dislike as much as we. Wherefore let us proceed to examine the reasons that are brought either of the one side, or the other, to confirm their several interpretations of these words; and let us see how Bellarmine³ weakeneth the reasons brought by St Au-

¹ “Οὐδὲ γὰρ, οἶμαι, φαῖεν ἂν, ὡς γυμνὴ καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἡ θεότης τοῦ μονογενοῦς καταπεφοίτηκε μὲν εἰς ἄδου, διεκήρυξε δὲ τοῖς ἐκεῖσε πνεύμασιν, ἄποπτος οὕσα παντελῶς. Κρεῖττον γὰρ αἰεὶ τοῦ ὁρᾶσθαι τὸ θεῖον. Ἄλλ' οὐ δοκήσει καὶ ἐσχηματισμένως εἰς τὸ ψυχῆς εἶδος αὐτὴν μεμορφῶσθαι δώσομεν. παραιτητέον γὰρ πανταχῇ τὴν δόκησιν. Ἄλλ' ὥσπερ τοῖς γῆς συνεστράφη μετὰ σαρκὸς, οὕτω καὶ ταῖς ἐν ἄδου ψυχαῖς διεκήρυξεν ἴδιον ἔχειν φόρημα τὴν ἐνωθεῖσαν αὐτῷ ψυχὴν.”—Cyril. Alexandr. De Recta Fide ad Theodosium. [Tom. v. Part. 2. p. 20. Lut. Par. 1638.]

“Τοιγάρτοι δικαίως τὸ τετελέσθαι φησιν, ἀλλ' ὥρας ἤδη καλούσης τῆς εἰς τὸ καὶ ἐθέλειν τοῖς ἐν ἄδῃ διακηρύξαι πνεύμασιν· ἐπεδήμησε γὰρ ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ, καὶ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσέβῃ τὸν θάνατον.”—Id. in Joan. Lib. xii. [Tom. iv. p. 1068.]

² “Ideo passus est ut exspoliatis inferis virtute Patris, devicta morte resurgens cum animabus ereptis in cœlum ascenderet. Omnis enim quicumque viso Salvatore apud inferos speravit de illo salutem liberatus est, Petro apostolo hoc testante; dicit enim quia et mortuis prædicatus est.”—Pseudo-Ambros. in Rom. x. [Tom. ii. Append. col. 86. Par. 1690.]

³ “S. Augustinus ex hac ipsa ratione dicit se moveri ad hoc ut non intelligat per hunc spiritum animam Christi, nam cum dicitur ‘vivificatus autem spiritu,’ si spiritus significaret animam, sequeretur ali-

gustine, and improveth his interpretation by reasons brought against it. The first reason whereby St Augustine confirmeth his interpretation, is, for that mortification in the flesh, and vivification in the Spirit mentioned by the apostle, cannot be understood of the body and soul of Christ, as they that follow the other interpretation do understand them, seeing Christ never dying in soul, could not be said to be quickened in it. Besides that the very phrase of the scripture opposing flesh and Spirit in Christ, doth ever import the infirmity of his human nature, and the power of his Deity: and in other men, that part that is renewed by the sanctification of the Spirit, and that which is not yet so renewed. Against the former part of this reason of St Augustine, Bellarmine opposeth himself, saying that it is not good: seeing a thing may be said to be quickened that was never dead, if it be preserved from dying, and kept alive. But he should know, that only those things may be said to be quickened, in that they were preserved from dying, which otherwise, if they had not been so preserved, might have been killed, or died of themselves. Which cannot be verified of the soul of Christ, that could neither die of itself, nor be killed by any other; and therefore the soul of Christ cannot be said to be quickened in this sense. The place in the seventh of the Acts, brought by Bellarmine to prove, that those things may be said to be quickened that were never dead, besides that it is nothing to the purpose, is strangely wrested. For St Stephen in that place speaketh nothing of vivification or quickening in that sense we now speak of it, but of multiplying and increasing; saying, that "After the death of Joseph, there rose up another

quando animam Christi mortuam fuisse: nihil enim vivificatur nisi quod mortuum est. Vult igitur ipse sensum esse, Christum mortificatum fuisse carne, quia secundum carnem mortuus est, et vivificatum spiritu, quia virtute Spiritus Dei excitatus est a mortuis.

"Sed hæc ratio non concludit: nam in scriptura passim dicitur 'vivificari id quod non occiditur,' 1 Reg. xxvii. 'Virum et mulierem non vivificabat David,' id est, non relinquebat vivum, et 2 Reg. viii. dicitur David extendisse 'duos funiculos super Moab, unum ad occidendum, unum ad vivificandum,' id est, definivisse quot ex Moabitibus vellet occidi, quot servari. Et Act. vii. 'Afflixit patres nostros ut exponerent infantes suos ne vivificarentur,' id est, ut non viverent, sed occiderentur ad unum omnes."—Bellarm. [De Anima Christi, Lib. iv. cap. 13, p. 225.]

king in Egypt, that knew not Joseph, who evil intreated our fathers, and made them cast out their infants, and new-born children¹," εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογονεῖσθαι; that is, that they should not increase, and multiply: and therefore Bellarmine should not in reason so have pressed the Latin word of vivification used by the vulgar translator, seeing the original importeth no such thing as he endeavoureth to prove. But to take away all doubt touching the words of Peter, there is a decree of the Tridentine council², that the Romanists in all their disputations, readings, and sermons, shall use the vulgar translation, and no way dare to refuse the authority of it under any pretence whatsoever. Now in the ordinary readings of the vulgar translation³ the words of the apostle do lie in this sort: "Christ died for sinners, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God; mortified in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit, in which Spirit he went and preached," &c. So that according to this reading, the apostle speaketh not of Christ's quickening, but of our quickening in the Spirit; which cannot be understood of the human soul of Christ, but of the Spirit of sanctification; whence it followeth, that Christ going to preach in that Spirit, by the force whereof we are quickened and made alive from the death of sin, went in his eternal Spirit of Deity, and not in his human soul. "But," saith Bellarmine⁴, "it cannot be said properly, but metaphorically only, that Christ did go in his eternal Spirit of Deity to preach

¹ Acts vii. 18.

² "Insuper eadem sacrosancta synodus considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse ecclesiæ Dei, si ex omnibus Latinis editionibus quæ circumferuntur sacrorum librorum quænam pro authentica habenda sit innotescat; statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio quæ longo toto sæculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus et expositionibus, pro authentica habeatur; ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat."—Concil. Trident. Session. iv. Decret. de Editione et Usu Sacrorum Librorum. [Labbe, Concil. Tom. xx. Ven. 1733.]

³ ["Christus semel pro peccatis nostris mortuus est, justus pro injustis, ut nos offerret Deo: mortificatos quidem carne, vivificatos autem spiritu. In quo et his qui in carcere erant spiritu veniens prædicavit, &c."]—Vers. Vulg.]

⁴ "Illud 'veniens prædicavit' si de anima intelligatur proprie accipi poterit; vere enim venit ad locum ubi non erat: at si de divinitate, non potest accipi nisi improprie."—Bellarm. ubi supra. [p. 225.]

to the old world." Suppose it to be so: is it so strange a thing that such local motions should be metaphorically attributed unto God, that we should thereupon deny the going of Christ to preach to have been in his eternal Spirit of Deity? Do we not often read in scripture of God's coming down to see what things are done on earth? But it is hard to understand by spirits in prison, the souls of men shut up in the prisons of their bodies, and in the dark dungeons of ignorance and impiety, as Augustine doth; and therefore we must not follow his interpretation. Surely, it is true that it is something hard to understand these words of the apostle as St Augustine doth, and therefore we rather follow the interpretation of Andradius¹ before mentioned, who expoundeth the words of the apostle so as Augustine doth, save that he thinketh that they to whom Christ preached in his eternal Spirit in the days of Noe are named spirits in prison, not for that they were so when he preached to them, but when Peter wrote of them. Thus we see the cardinal hath not yet greatly weakened any of Augustine's reasons. One reason more St Augustine hath, so forcible and strong, to confirm the interpretation he followeth, that I think the Jesuit will hardly be able to say much against it: "If the apostle," saith St Augustine², "had meant to describe the descending of Christ in his human soul to deliver the patriarchs, he would not have expressed his meaning by saying, 'He went and preached to the spirits in prison sometimes disobedient in the days of Noe.'" For, to say, as Bellarmine³ doth, that Christ went and preached only to the good spirits in *limbus*, but that the apostle describing the same nameth the disobedient in the

¹ Defens. Fidei Trident. Lib. II. fol. 172. [Vid. p. 114, not. 3, supr.]

² "Eorum dico multa millia hominum, qui Deum ignorantes et dæmonum vel simulacrorum cultui dediti a temporibus Noe usque ad passionem Christi ex hac vita emigrarunt, quos apud inferos Christus inveniens quomodo illis non prædicavit, sed illis tantum qui in diebus Noe increduli fuerunt, cum fabricaretur arca? Aut si omnibus prædicavit, cur illos solos Petrus commemoravit, prætermissa multitudo tam immemorabili cæterorum."—August. ubi supra.

³ "Dico præterea Christum prædicasse in inferno omnibus bonis spiritibus, sed nominatim fuisse expressos illos, qui fuerunt in diebus Noe increduli, quia de illis erat magis dubium an essent salvi necne, cum puniti fuerint a Deo, et submersi aquis diluvii."—Bellarm. ubi supra.

days of Noe, lest it might be thought that they all perished, is frivolous; seeing there was no reason why the apostle in describing the descending of Christ into *limbus*, should be so careful to let all men know that they did not all perish that contemned the preaching of Noe: and besides, if the apostle had meant any such thing, he would have added, that howsoever these men were disobedient for a time, yet they did afterwards repent, obeying the voice of God speaking by the mouth of Noe. If any man shall ask, as Bellarmine doth, why Peter should mention Christ's preaching in his eternal Spirit to them in the days of Noe, more than to them in the days of Abraham or Moses; the answer is easy: for therefore doth he mention them rather than any other, because they that lived before the flood were men of another world, and are named the old world; and it was the greatest mutation of the world that ever was before or since, that followed upon the refusal of Christ's preaching by the mouth of Noe, who was the same then that he is now; the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.

That which the cardinal hath in the conclusion, that the fathers generally believed that Christ descended into hell, we think to be most true; but that the souls of all the just were in hell till the resurrection of Christ, and then delivered thence, is not the opinion of the fathers. For Augustine¹ clearly denieth that the spirits of the just dying before Christ, were in hell till the coming of Christ; and touching the rest of them, some thought that the spirits of the just are and shall be in a place of sequestration, separate from the presence of God till the general resurrection: so that according to their opinion, Christ by descending into hell did not deliver them from thence; of which opinion we find Irenæus, Tertullian, and some others, to have been. Some there were that thought that Christ delivered out of the lowest hell such as believed in him when he came thither; and some, that he went not to hell to deliver any from thence, but to preserve and keep such from going thither, as otherwise should have gone thither, if by virtue of his descending they had not been preserved from falling into that hideous and devouring gulf. So that, though it were ever most certainly resolved, that Christ descended into hell, to triumph over the prince of darkness, to fasten

¹ August. loco citato.

condemnation to the devil and his angels, and to preserve all believers and faithful ones from falling into the pit of destruction; yet, as it appeareth by Augustine's Epistle to Evodius, there was no certain resolution amongst the ancient, whether Christ delivered any, or all; or whom he delivered, if any, when he went into hell.

CHAPTER XX.

OF THE MERIT OF CHRIST: OF HIS NOT MERITING FOR HIMSELF, AND HIS MERITING FOR US.

HAVING spoken sufficiently of the sufferings of Christ, and his descending into hell, it remaineth that in the next place we come to speak of his merit; where we must observe three things: first, whether he might or did merit: secondly, whether he merited for himself: thirdly, how, and in what sort he merited for us.

The first of these questions is moved, because Christ being *in termino* and *comprehensor*, that is, in possession of all desired blessedness, and seeing God face to face, even while he lived here, may seem to have been *extra statum merendi*, that is, in such a state and condition wherein there is no place for merit, and so not to have merited: to merit being proper to them that are *viatores*, that is, men journeying towards the possession of heaven-happiness not yet attained. Wherefore, for the clearing of this point the divines do note¹, that Christ

¹ "Ad propositum loquendo de merito prout consistit in bono velle voluntatis, dico quod Christus meruit nobis tali velle; et dico quod radix omnis meriti consistit, proprie loquendo de merito, in affectione justitiæ voluntatis; non autem in affectione commodi, nec in affectione justitiæ ut ordinat affectionem commodi. Hoc patet quia primum objectum circa quod aliquis meretur primo, est ipse Deus, secundum quod affectione justitiæ vult Deo bonum, ut esse, et bene esse, scilicet justum, sapientem, &c. sed voluntas affectione commodi respicit proprium bonum, et aliquando inordinate, nisi reguletur et ordinetur affectione justitiæ: ideo meritum non consistit primo in affectione justitiæ ut moderatur, et ordinat affectionem commodi circa proprium bonum, sed sicut primum demeritum angelorum fuit inordinatus motus et desiderium beatitudinis circa Deum.

"Sed Christus secundum aliquid fuit viator, et passibilis secundum

in his human nature, in the days of his flesh, was both *viator* and *comprehensor*; *in termino*, and *extra terminum*: that is, both a man journeying toward heaven-happiness, and one that had already attained it, being already come to the uttermost bound of all his desires; and yet in a sort not being come unto it, because, howsoever he was perfectly joined with God *affectione justitiæ*, that is, with that affection that yieldeth unto God the praise, honour, and love that is due unto him, and saw him face to face with clear and perfect vision; yet he was not so fully joined to him as he is to be enjoyed *affectione commodi*, that is, with that affection that seeketh after pleasing delight; but that he suffered many bitter, grievous, and unpleasant things, fasting, watching, weeping and wearying himself; in all which respects being *extra terminum*, that is, not yet come to the uttermost extent and bound of that is desired, he was in a state of meriting. But because the enduring of these bitter, grievous, and afflictive evils, may seem rather to pertain to the nature of satisfaction than merit, therefore they add, that howsoever in respect of the perfection of his Divine and heavenly virtues he were *in termino*, that is, come to the uttermost bound and extent thereof, yet in the expressing of the actions of them, he fitted himself to the condition of men here below, as appeared in the actions of his love and obedience, in that he gave himself for the pacifying of his Father's wrath, the satisfying of his justice, and the pro-meriting of our good: and besides, he had the actions of many virtues that are proper to the conversation of this world, and whereof there is no use in heaven,

partem sensitivam, et portionem inferiorem voluntatis; ideo multa habuit objecta præsentia sensibus et portioni inferiori, circa quæ potuit libere velle contra affectionem commodi quæ semper est ad conveniens illi, cujus est: ideo jejunando, vigilando, orando, et multis aliis talibus potuit mereri, vel exercendo talia exterius vel volendo interius talia propter Deum.

“Tunc dico quod licet angeli habeant bonas operationes circa nos, vel alii beati, qui tamen illi actus sunt inclusi in beatitudine illorum, hoc est ratione beatitudinis et ex illius plenitudine et collatione obligentur nobis a Deo; potest dici quod non merentur: sed hujusmodi operationes Christi prædictæ non includuntur in sua beatitudine, ideo illos actus meruit; quia quantum ad illos actus fuit viator non comprehensor, ita quod radicaliter includantur in sua beatitudine.”—Scotus in 3 Sent. Dist. xviii. Quæst. unic. [Tom. vii. p. 386.]

or in heaven-happiness, but in the way and journey towards heaven ; as temperance, sobriety, fortitude, patience, and the observation of the ceremonial and judicial law : in which respect he may very properly be said to have been in a state of meriting, and to have merited.

Wherefore presupposing that Christ might and did merit, let us see whether he merited anything for himself. The Papists¹ impute I know not what impiety to Calvin, because he saith Christ merited not for himself, but for us only, and urge against him that saying of the apostle, when he saith, that “ Christ humbled himself, and was made obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, and that therefore God exalted him, and gave him a name above every name².” Wherefore let us take a view of that they teach touching this point, that so we may the better discern whether Calvin be justly blamed by them, or not. The schoolmen generally agree, that Christ neither did nor could merit the grace of personal union, the habitual perfections of his human soul, or the vision of God, because he possessed all these from the beginning ; and it would have been a matter of more imperfection to have wanted any of them at the first, than of perfection to have gotten them by merit afterwards. Yet the Master of Sentences³, and others, resolve that he did procure unto himself by his merit the impassibility and glorification of his body. But Scotus⁴ very acutely and wittily objecteth against them that so

¹ “ Dicimus ergo, Christum meruisse sibi illa omnia quæ accepit post passionem suam. Et probatur hoc primo expressis scripturis. Ad Philip. ii. : ‘ Humiliavit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis, propter quod et Deus exaltavit illum, &c.’ Ad Hebr. ii. : ‘ Videmus Jesum propter passionem mortis gloria et honore coronatum.’ Respondet Calvinus, his testimoniis solum significari, Christum post passionem suam habuisse gloriam, non autem unum fuisse causam alterius.”—Bellarm. De Christo Mediatore. Lib. v. cap. 9. [Tom. i. p. 239.]

² Philip. ii. 8.

³ “ De merito etiam Christi prætermittendum non est, de quo quidam dicere solent, quod non sibi sed membris tantum meruerit. Meruit quidem membris redemptionem a diabolo, a peccato, a pœna, et regni reservationem, ut amota ignea romphæa, libere pateret introitus ; sed et sibi meruit impassibilitatis et immortalitatis gloriam.”—Petrus Lombardus, Sent. Lib. 3. Dist. xviii. [cap. i. fol. 131. Colon. 1513.]

⁴ “ Sed nunquid meruit sibi impassibilitatem animæ et corporis ?

think, that Christ cannot be said to have merited the impassibility and glorification of his body, because they would have been found in it, from the very first instant of the union of the natures of God and man in him, by virtue of that union, before any act of his, had not the natural consequence and flowing of them from that union been stayed and hindered by special dispensation, for the working of our salvation: and therefore he saith, that if we will defend the Master of Sentences from error in this point, we must so construe his words as that Christ did not directly merit glorification and impassibility, but only the removing of that miraculous stay of the natural redundance of glory from his soul, filled with the happy vision of his Deity, into his body. But surely this favourable construction will not help the matter; for seeing the miraculous stay of the redundance of glory from the soul of Christ into his body, was of itself to cease, when that should be performed for the effecting whereof such stay was made, he could no more merit such remove of stay than the glory itself, that in respect of the grace of personal union would as naturally have been communicated to his body, as it was in his soul, had not God for special purpose stayed and hindered such redundance. So that we shall find, that howsoever the Papists do press certain testimonies of scripture, as if they would prove out of them that Christ merited the name above all names, and the fulness of all power both in heaven and in earth, which he could no more merit than to be God; yet in the end they are forced to confess (so great is the truth which will ever prevail) that he neither merited the personal union of his two natures, the perfection of his habitual graces, the vision of God, nor the glorification of his body, but only the removing of that stay and impediment that hindered the

Magister dicit in litera quod sic. Contra, illud quod infuisset, si non fuisset per miraculum impeditum, quantum est ex ratione sui ante omnem actum causatum illius personæ, non cadit sub merito illius personæ; sed gloria et impassibilitas corporis et animæ infuissent in primo instanti unionis, nisi per miraculum fuissent prohibita: ergo...

"Potest dici, pie sentiendo cum Magistro, et pie glossando, quod quamvis non meruerit directe impassibilitatem utriusque, meruit tamen amotionem impedimenti propter quod non infuerunt statim, scilicet desitionem miraculi prohibentis redundantiam gloriæ in portionem inferiorem, et in corpus."—Scotus in 3 Sent. Dist. xviii. Quæst. unic. [p. 401.]

flowing of glory from his soul into his body : and finding that this stay or hinderence was to cease of itself, so soon as the work of our redemption should be wrought, and consequently that he could not merit it, they fly for help to a distinction of merits, which they make to be of three sorts. For there is, as they say, one kind of merit that maketh a thing due which was not due before ; another, that maketh a thing more due than it was before ; and a third, that maketh a thing more ways due than at first it was¹. The two first kinds of merit, they confess, did not agree to Christ, there being nothing that was not due unto him in as high degree in the beginning, as ever it was afterwards. But they say that he merited in the third sort or kind, in that he made those things that were due unto him as consequents of the personal union of his two natures, to be due unto him as a reward of his passion. This truly is a very silly evasion ; seeing that cannot be a reward of a man's labours, that was due to him in as high degree before as after his work is done. He that laboureth in the field or vineyard of another man, and she that nourisheth a child that is not her own, travail both in hope of reward ; but that reward must of necessity be something that was not due to them before such travail ; yea, he that dresseth his own vine, and she that nourisheth her own children, look to the recompense of reward ; but that reward is no other thing but the prosperity and increase of their fields and vineyards, and the growth of their children, like the olive-branches round about their table ; which, without such pains and travail, they could not look for. In like sort, a man may say to his child, " This land shall be the reward of thy dutiful behaviour," if he have power to put it from him if his behaviour be not dutiful ; but if he have not, it is ridiculous to promise it as a reward, seeing a reward is ever some good to be gained by our well-

¹ "Mereri ex condigno tribus modis contingit. Uno modo mereri est, ex indebito facere debitum, sicut meretur quis in gratiæ infusione, et motu liberi arbitrii. Alio modo mereri est de debito facere magis debitum, sicut contingit de profectu in profectum, de virtute in virtutem. Tertio modo mereri est de debito uno modo facere debitum alio modo, ut de debito per habitum facere debitum per usum, et de debito per unum actum facere debitum per alium æque bonum. Omnibus his modis Christus meruit nobis."—Bonaventura, in 3 Sent. Dist. xviii. Art. i. Quæst. 2. [Tom. v. p. 218. Rom. 1596.]

doing or patient suffering, countervailing the difficulty in doing, and bitterness in suffering. It is therefore most absurd, that anything which is a man's own in as ample sort before he begins his work as after he hath done it, should be the reward of his work. But some man perhaps will say, that a thing that was due in respect of the habit resting in the mind, may become due in respect of the act done : and consequently, that that which was due one way, may become more ways due. Surely we make no question but it may, because it was due to the habit as to the root of such action, when occasion should be offered and opportunity serve, and not otherwise. But seeing in Christ the glorification and impassibility of his body was due unto him as a consequent of personal union, and not of any habitual quality, or habit inclining and fitting unto action, therefore that could not become due to any action of Christ that was due unto him in respect of some former thing, as that may be due to the action of a man that was formerly due to the habit that is the root of such action.

The places of scripture that are brought to prove that Christ merited for himself, are specially two : for though there be a third, as pregnant as any of the other, in the first to the Hebrews, where it is said of Christ, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity ; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows¹:" yet do they not much stand upon it, because if it prove any thing, it proveth that Christ merited the grace of unction, which they deny, who teach that Christ merited for himself. The first of the two places alleged to prove that Christ merited for himself, is in the second to the Hebrews : where the apostle saith, "We see Jesus for the passion of death crowned with glory and honour²." But the words, as some think, are not so to be read, but to be placed in this sort : "We see Jesus, who was for a little while made lower than the angels, for the passion of death," that is, that he might suffer death, "crowned with glory and honour ;" so expressing the final cause of his humiliation, and not the meritorious cause of his exaltation. This conjecture is made exceeding probable by those words added by the apostle, "that he might taste of death:" which otherwise have no coherence with any part of his speech. The second place

¹ Heb. i. 9.

² Heb. ii. 9.

that they bring, is that of the second to the Philippians: the words are these: "Christ humbled himself, and became obedient unto the death, even the death of the cross: wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, &c.¹" This place, as Hugo de Sancto Victore² hath fitly noted, importeth, that the humiliation of the Son of God becoming man, was the cause of the exaltation of the nature of man; for when he personally assumed the nature of man and became man, man became God Almighty, having all power, and a name above all names: according to that of Leo³, *Divinæ majestatis exinanitio, servilis formæ in summa provectio est*; that is, "The abasing of the divine majesty, and person of the Son of God, is the high advancing and exaltation of the form of a servant:" and therefore he addeth, that *Ex quo Deus cœpit esse homo, et homo cœpit esse Deus; Deus cœpit esse homo subjectus, et homo cœpit esse Deus perfectus. Si Deus humiliatus est quantum potuit in homine, homo sublimatus non est quantum potuit in Deo?* that is, "When God began to be man, and man began to be God, God began to be a man in subjection and humility, and man to be God in the height of perfection; for if God were humbled, as much as he might be, in that he became man, was not man exalted, as much as he might be, in that he became God?" God was humbled, when first he became man, *In quantum homo, dignitate, in quantum bonus, voluntate*: that is, "in that a man, in condition and state, in that a good man, in will and mind;" but manifested the same more specially in his passion. Likewise the man Christ was exalted, when he was born the Son of God, but manifested the same more specially after his resurrection than before. For we must not think that the man Christ did then first receive the full and perfect power of Deity, when he said, "All power is given me in heaven and in earth⁴:" seeing before the uttering of those words he commanded the devils, had the angels to do him service, and made the very elements of the world to bow and bend at his

¹ Phil. ii. 8, 9.

² Hugo de Sancto Victore, De Sacram. Fid. Lib. ii. Part. i. cap. 6. [Tom. iii. p. 431. Mogunt. 1617.]

³ Leo, Serm. xii. [Vid. Serm. xxx. Tom. i. col. 109. Ven. 1753.]

⁴ Matt. xxviii. 18.

pleasure. Wherefore this place is unadvisedly brought by our adversaries, to prove that Christ merited for himself, it being most clear and evident, that the name above all names mentioned in this place, which is the name of God Almighty, was given to the Son of God *donatione naturali*, that is, “by natural communication,” when he was begotten of his Father before all eternity, and to the man Christ *donatione gratuita*, that is, “by free gift,” when God was made man, and man became God, as the ordinary gloss upon these words fitly observeth: and so could no more be merited by the passion of Christ, than it was possible for him to do any thing whereby to merit to be God. And hereupon Calvin¹ rightly asketh (which all the Papists in the world are not able to answer), *Quibus meritis assequi potuit homo ut judex esset mundi, caput angelorum, atque ut potiretur summo Dei imperio?* that is, “By what merits could man attain to be judge of the world, head of angels, and to have the highest authority and power of God?” But some man will say, that Christ pronounceth, “it was necessary that he should suffer, and so enter into his glory²,” and that therefore it seemeth, he could not have entered into it unless he had suffered. *Quomodo ergo suam*, saith Hugo, *si oportuit? et quomodo oportuit, si suam? Si gloria ejus fuit, quomodo ut ad illam intraret, pati oportuit? Sed suam propter se; oportuit propter nos*: that is, “How then was it his glory, if he could not enter into it unless he suffered? and how was it necessary that he should suffer to enter into it, if it were his? Surely it was his in respect of himself; and it was necessary he should enter it by suffering, only in respect of us.” For Christ truly if he had pleased might have entered into his glory some other way, and have received it in what sort he would, even as he needed never to have wanted it, unless he had pleased: but he would for our sakes by punishment enter into his glory, that dying he might take away the fear of death, and rising again he might restore unto us the hope of glorification: he would not go any other way, because we could not go any other way: we would, but could not; he could, but would not: *Quia si aliter ivisset, pervenisset, sed non subvenisset*: that is, “because if he had gone

¹ Calvin. Instit. Lib. II. cap. 17. [p. 137. Amst. 1667.]

² Luke xxiv. 26.

any other way, he might have entered in himself, but could not have brought us in with him."

There is nothing therefore that Christ gained to himself by his passion, but that he was made an example of suffering to all that believe in him, and a cause of glorification to all them that suffer with him, that they may be glorified with him: but what did this profit him? He went before, and we all follow him: whose good is this? I find men out of the way, I go before them to show them the way, and all follow me: what doth it profit me? I knew the way, and could have gone it by myself alone: *Sed non esset causa pergendi, nisi compassio esset subveniendi*: that is, "but there were no cause of my going, if the compassionate consideration of such as know not the way did not move me, by going before them to be a guide unto them." Thus then we say that Christ merited nothing for himself, not because we would detract anything from him, for he did things worthy of most ample rewards, if there had been anything he had not already, that might have been given and added to him, or that he had not already a just claim unto: but because we admire his perfection, which was so great from the beginning, that nothing could be after added unto it, and praise his goodness, that came into this world for our sakes only, and not for his own good. Wherefore let us proceed to see how, and in what sort, he merited for us.

In the merit of Christ two things are to be considered. The worth of those actions and works of virtue which he performed: and the dignity of his divine and infinite person performing them. Touching the former, though the actions of the best men that ever were done in the state of grace, and proceeding from the working of God's Spirit, be not worthy of the glory that shall be revealed, yet we constantly affirm and teach, that the actions of Christ, done in his human nature, were worthy of that glory, and therefore dare not deny, that Christ merited for us *ex condigno*, as some of the schoolmen do. But for the better clearing of this point, touching the merit of Christ, we must observe, that to merit, simply, absolutely, and properly so named, four things concur. For first, he that will merit or deserve anything at another man's hand, must do something that the other had no former claim unto. Secondly, he must do something that may be

beneficial and good unto him of whom he desireth to deserve something. Thirdly, he must do something that may be beneficial in as high a degree unto him, as he looketh to be benefited by him again. And fourthly, he must not hurt and wrong him as much one way, as he benefiteth him another; for if he do so, he loseth all merit of reward.

These being the things required to the nature of merit, strictly so named, no creature can in this sort merit anything at God's hand, seeing there is nothing that any creature can do which God may not justly claim and challenge as due, in respect of good already done to it; or whereby it may any way benefit or profit him, according to that in Job, that "Our righteousness reacheth not unto God¹:" yet such is the goodness of Almighty God towards his poor creatures, that, as if he had no claim to their well-doings, in respect of benefits already bestowed on them, and as if they were as good and beneficial to him, as they are good in themselves, seeking in all his works to communicate, and not to receive any good, in the day he made them he covenanted with them to give them rewards answerable to the worth of their actions: which gracious condescending of Almighty God to the condition of his creatures presupposed, Adam in the state of his innocency, and before he fell, might have merited and deserved good at God's hands; but the best men in the world since his fall are excluded from all possibility of meriting anything, especially heaven-happiness, properly of him: first, because they have lost all that power of well-doing which originally in the state of their creation they had, and can perform nothing that is good, unless it be given unto them by a new free gift, for which they shall rather be indebted to God, than any way bind him unto them. Secondly, because they offend him as much one way as they please him another. And thirdly, because there is no equality between the good actions of virtue which they perform and do, and the rewards that are laid up in heaven, neither in total, perpetual, and constant doing of that they do, nor in the manner, quality, and measure thereof; the height of heaven-happiness incomparably exceeding all other knowledge and desire, according to that of the apostle²: "The eye hath not seen, the ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things

¹ Job xxxv. 7.

² 1 Cor. ii. 9.

God hath prepared for them that love him." But none of these things exclude Christ from meriting in the nature of man, which he assumed: for he brought the fulness of grace with him into the world, and it was natural unto him: he no way offended or displeased God his Father: and there was a perfect equality between his actions and the rewards of heaven, in that he loved God with that kind, degree, and measure of love, wherewith men love him in heaven; ardently, without defect; entirely, and totally, without distraction; perpetually, without intermission; and constantly, without possibility of ever ceasing so to do.

Wherefore let us pass from the worth and value of those works of virtue that Christ performed, to the consideration of the dignity of his divine and infinite person performing them. Which dignity and infinity of the person of Christ, to which nothing could be added, made the things he did to pro-merit, and to procure good to others, and to infinite other. *Christus*, saith a learned schoolman¹, *meruit omnibus quantum fuit ex sufficientia sui, pro eo quod in ipso fuit gratia: non sicut in singulari homine, sed sicut in capite totius Ecclesiæ; propter quod fructus passionis ejus redundare potuit in omnia Ecclesiæ membra: et quia, ut dicit Damascenus, ratione unitatis divinitatis cum humanitate, Christus operatur ea quæ sunt hominis, supra hominem, operatio ejus extendebat se ad totam naturam, quod non potest operatio puri hominis. Hujus diversitatis ratio reducenda est non in habitualement aliquam gratiam creatam sed increatam; quod pro multis sufficit finita gratia, hæc sufficientia est ex gratia infinita et increata.* That is, "Christ merited for all sufficiently on his part, in that grace was found in him, not as in a particular man, but as in the head of the whole Church: for which cause the fruit of his passion might redound to all the members of the same Church: and because (as Damascene saith) by reason of the union of the natures of God and man in his person, he doth the works of a man in a more excellent sort than any mere man can do, the benefit and force of his working and operation extended to the whole nature of man, which the action of a mere man cannot do. The reason of which difference is not to be attributed to any habitual created

¹ Paludan. In 3 Sent. Dist. xviii. [Quæst. 2. ad fin. fol. 95, b. Par. 1517.]

grace, but to that which is increate: for that the finite grace that is in Christ, (that is, his virtue, and work of virtue,) is available for the good of many, it is from his infinite and increate grace.

CHAPTER XXI.

OF THE BENEFITS WHICH WE RECEIVE FROM CHRIST.

HAVING spoken of the satisfaction and merit of Christ, it remaineth that we speak of the benefits which we receive from him; which are all most fully expressed by the name of Redemption, which is the freeing of us from that miserable bondage and captivity wherein we were formerly holden by reason of Adam's sin. This bondage was twofold; first, in respect of sin; and secondly, in respect of punishment. In respect of sin, we were bondmen to Satan, whose will we did, according to that of the apostle, "His servants ye are to whom ye obey¹." In respect of punishment, we were become bondmen to Almighty God, the righteous Judge of the world, who useth Satan as an instrument of his wrath, and an executioner of his dreadful judgments against such as do offend him and provoke him to wrath. These being the kinds of captivity and bondage wherein we were holden, it will not be hard to see how we are freed and redeemed from the same. There is no redemption, as the divines do note, but either by exchange of prisoners, by force and strong hand, or by paying of a price. Redemption by exchange of prisoners is then, when we set free those whom we hold as captives taken from our enemies, that they may make free such as they hold of ours: and this kind of redemption hath no place in the deliverance of sinful men from sin and misery; but their deliverance is only wrought by strong hand, and paying of a price. For Christ redeemed us from the bondage of sin, in that by the force and working of his grace making us dislike it, hate it, repent of it, and leave it, he violently took us out of Satan's hands, who tyrannically and unjustly had taken possession of us: but from the bondage of punishment in respect

¹ Rom. vi. 16.

whereof we were become bondmen to Almighty God, he redeemed us not by force and strong hand, but by paying a price, satisfying his justice, and suffering what our sins had deserved; that so being pacified towards us, he might cease to punish us, and discharge Satan, who was but the executioner of his wrath, from afflicting us any longer.

In this sort do we conceive of the work of our redemption, wrought for us by Christ; and therefore it is absurdly and untruly said by Matthew Kellison¹, in his late published Survey of the supposed new religion, that we make Christ an absurd Redeemer, for we speak no otherwise of Christ the Redeemer than we have learned in the Church and house of God. But for the satisfaction of the reader, let us see how he goeth about to convince us of such absurdity as he chargeth us with. "The Protestants," saith he, "do teach (than which nothing can be more absurd) that Christ's passion was our justice, merit, satisfaction; that there is no justice but Christ's, no good works but his works, no merit but his merit, no satisfaction but his satisfaction; that there is no justice or sanctity inherent in man, nor none necessary; that no laws

¹ "Who will arrogate unto himself the name of a Christian, and will not also acknowledge Christ for his Redeemer? Dare now the Reformers deny Christ the title of a Redeemer? They dare not. Yet by their doctrine they make him a most absurd Redeemer, and so more dishonour him than if they had denied him this title altogether.

"For they say that there is no justice but Christ's justice, no good work but his works, no merit but his merit, no satisfaction but his, and consequently that Christ's passion was our justice, our merit, and our satisfaction. Out of which doctrine they infer, first, that neither there is any inherent justice or sanctity in man, neither is there any necessary at all, because Christ's justice is ours by imputation, and that is sufficient. Secondly, they gather out of the same doctrine that good works are not necessary, because Christ's works are ours, and they are sufficient. Thirdly, hence they infer also that no laws, either human or divine, can bind us in conscience, because Christ's passion was the ransom which freed us from all laws. Fourthly, that we are bound to no satisfaction, because Christ's satisfaction was sufficient. Fifthly, that no sins nor evil works can hurt us, because Christ's justice being ours, no sin can make us sinners. Sixthly, that no hell nor judgment remaineth for us, because Christ's justice being ours, sins can neither be imputed to us in this life, nor punished in the next. And in these points they say that Christian liberty consisteth."—Kellison, Survey, Book III. chap. II. [p. 143. Douay, 1605.]

can bind us, because Christ's death was the ransom that freed us from all laws, divine and human; that no sins nor evil works can hurt us, because Christ's justice being ours, no sins can make us sinners; that no hell or judgment remaineth for us whatsoever we do, because Christ's justice being ours, sins can neither be imputed to us in this life, nor punished in the next, and that herein consisteth Christian liberty." A more shameless slanderer, and trifling smatterer, I think was never heard of. For some of these assertions are undoubted truths, against which no man may oppose himself, unless he will be branded with the mark of impiety and blasphemy: as that Christ's passion is our justice, merit, and satisfaction; that there is no merit properly so named, but Christ's merit; no propitiatory and expiatory satisfaction, but Christ's satisfaction. And the others are nothing else but shameless and hellish slanders, and mere devices, and fancies of his idle brain, without all ground of truth: as that there is no justice nor sanctity inherent in man, nor none necessary; that good works are not necessary; that no laws can bind us; that no sins nor evil works can hurt us; and that no hell nor judgment remaineth for us whatsoever we do. For we most constantly affirm and teach, that there is both justice and sanctity inherent in man, though not so perfect as that he may safely trust unto it, and desire to be judged according to the perfection of it in the day of trial. Likewise we teach, that good works are in such sort necessary to salvation, that without holiness, and a desire at the least to perform the works of sanctification, no man shall ever see God. Neither do we say that no laws can bind us, as he slanderously misreporteth us, but we constantly teach, that not to do the things contained and prescribed in the law of God, is damnable and damning sin, if God upon our repentance forgive it not. And therefore Bellarmine¹, though he wrongeth us in like

¹ "Dicent fortasse non ita se intelligere libertatem a lege quasi prævaricatio legis non sit peccatum, sed quod fidelibus ea prævaricatio non imputetur. Hunc enim sensum videntur efficere verba Lutheri in lib. de Votis Monasticis, ubi dicit in eo consistere libertatem quod pia conscientia sit libera ab omnibus operibus, non quidem faciendis sed accusantibus et defendentibus, quia nulla sunt tam mala quæ possint eum accusare et damnare, nulla tam bona quæ eum queant defendere et justificare."—Bellarm. De Justif. Lib. iv. cap. 5. [Tom. iv. p. 473.]

sort as Kellison doth, yet in the end, like an honest man, he confesseth ingenuously that he doth wrong us, and showeth at large, that Luther in his book *de Votis Monasticis*, defineth the liberty of a Christian to consist, not in being freed from the duty of doing the things prescribed in the law of God, as if at his pleasure he might do them, or leave them undone; but in that there are no works forbidden in the law, that may stand with faith, so evil that they can condemn us, nor none there prescribed, performed by us, so good as to clear, defend, and justify us: so making us free *non ab operibus faciendis, sed defendentibus et accusantibus*; that is, “not from the necessity of doing the things that are commanded as good, but from seeking justification in works, or fearing condemnation for such evil works as we consent not fully unto, but dislike, resist against, and seek remission of.” Whereunto Calvin agreeth, teaching that Christian liberty freeth not from the duty of doing the things which the law requireth, but from doing them so as to have them examined and tried strictly according to the law and rule of justice: God in mercy accepting our works, though imperfect, if they proceed from a good conscience, and faith unfeigned. “But,” saith Kellison¹, “the Protestants teach that Christ came to be a Redeemer only, not a lawgiver: and therefore it seemeth they think men free from the duty of following the prescription of any law.” This surely is a very bad and weak inference. Christian men have nothing to do with Moses and his law, and may at their pleasure either break it or keep it, because Christ came to be a Redeemer, and not a lawgiver. For though it be true that Christ came not to give a new or more perfect law of moral duties, or to urge it more strictly than Moses did, as some imagine, in which sense our divines rightly deny him to have come as a lawgiver, yet he came to fulfil the law formerly given by the ministry of Moses: which things he performed; first, by clearing the meaning of it, and making it to be rightly understood, where it was mistaken; secondly, by meriting remission of the precedent breaches and transgressions of it; and thirdly, by

¹ “See what open injury against the plain text of Scripture, yea, and against all reason also, these men are not afraid to offer unto Christ, in taking from him the title and office of a lawgiver.”—Kellison, Survey, Book III. chap. v. [p. 155.]

giving grace that men may in some sort do the things it requireth. Wherefore if any man ask of us, whether it may be truly said, that Christ was a lawgiver to his Church, we answer, that our divines did never simply deny Christ to be a lawgiver, but only in sort before expressed. For they confess that he may truly be so named; first, because he writeth those laws in our hearts which Moses delivered written in tables of stone; and secondly, because he gave certain positive laws to Christian men, touching sacraments, ministry, and outward means of salvation, that were not of force before. Wherefore, to conclude this point, we do not think (as Kellison slanderously against his own conscience reporteth of us) that no sins can hurt us, that no hell nor judgment remaineth for us whatsoever we do; but we constantly teach, that they who commit sin with full consent, and persist therein, shall undoubtedly perish everlastingly. So that this is all that we say, that no sins, how grievous soever, resisted, disliked, repented of, and forsaken, can hurt us, and that no hell nor judgment remaineth for them whom the working of divine grace freeth from the dominion of sin, and the satisfaction of Christ from the condemnation of it. Against which doctrine, or any part of it, neither Kellison, nor any papist in the world, is able to take any just exception.

CHAPTER XXII.

OF THE MINISTRY OF THEM TO WHOM CHRIST COMMITTED
THE PUBLISHING OF THE RECONCILIATION BETWEEN GOD
AND MEN, PROCURED BY HIM.

THUS have we seen, first, the excellency of Christ our Saviour, whom God sent into the world, in the fulness of time, to be the great Shepherd of his sheep, the guide of his people, the light of the Gentiles, the glory of Israel, and a King to sit upon the throne of David for ever, having all power both in heaven and in earth. Secondly, what great things he did and suffered for us, to reconcile us unto God. Thirdly, what the benefits are which he procured for us and bestowed on us. Now it remaineth that we see to whom he committed the publishing of the joyful reconciliation between

God and man, the conversion of the world unto himself, and the government of such as should by believing become his people, when having finished the great work he came to perform, he was to return back to that God his Father that sent him. The apostle Saint Paul telleth us, that "Christ having triumphed over principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly¹" upon his cross², "led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men:...that he gave some to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the gathering together of the saints, the work of the ministry, and the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all meet in the unity of faith, and knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect man, even into the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ³." Amongst all those messengers of glad tidings, and ministers of Christ, appointed by him for the gathering together of the saints, the apostles were chief and principal; evangelists were assistants, which they used for the better settling and perfecting of things happily begun by them, and the writing of the evangelical histories concerning Christ: the prophets were such as foretold future things, that knew all secrets, and opened the hidden mysteries of God, speaking to the consciences of men in a strange and admirable manner; so that, as the apostle telleth us, "They that heard them prostrated themselves at their feet, acknowledging that God was in them⁴." These were temporary, and to continue but for a time. In the apostles, two sorts of things are to be considered, and distinguished by us: first, such as were proper to them, as fitting to those first beginnings of Christianity; and secondly, such as are of perpetual use and necessity, and so to be passed over to other, and continued to the end of the world.

The divines do note, that there were four things proper and peculiar to the apostles, and not communicable to any other of the ministers of Christ, appointed by him for the gathering together of his saints. The first was, immediate vocation: the second, infallibility of judgment: the third, generality of commission, to do all things pertaining to the ministry of salvation, in all places, and towards all persons: the fourth, the speaking in all the tongues and languages of

¹ Coloss. ii. 15.

² Or, 'in himself.'

³ Ephes. iv. 8, &c.

⁴ 1 Cor. xiv. 25.

the world, the knowledge of all secrets, and power to confirm their doctrine by signs and miracles, and by the imposition of their hands to give the like miraculous gifts of the Spirit to others. These jointly were not communicable to any other in those times, neither evangelists, nor prophets, as either not being called immediately, but appointed by the apostles, or not infallibly led into all truth: general commission they had not, but were taken into the fellowship of the apostles' labours, to assist their presence, and supply their absence, to build upon their foundation, and to perfect that they began. Lastly, though the having of miraculous gifts, and the power of working miracles simply, were not proper to the apostles, yet the having of them in such sort, as by the imposition of their hands to give the Spirit, enabling to work miracles, and to do miraculous things, was peculiar and proper to them; and therefore we read, that Philip¹ baptized, but that the apostles² went to confirm them by imposition of hands that were baptized by him, that so they might receive the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. And as these things were reserved as proper and peculiar unto the apostles, and not communicated to any other in their time, so are they not passed over to their after-comers by succession; but instead of immediate calling we have now succession; instead of infallibility of judgment, the direction of their writings, guiding us to the finding out of the truth: instead of general commission, particular assignation of several churches to rule, and parts of Christ's flock to feed; instead of miraculous gifts, and the apostles' power to confer them, a settled course of schools and universities fitting men for the work of the ministry; instead of their miracles wherewith they confirmed their doctrine, the faith already received, and by so many generations recommended unto us, as confirmed by the apostles' miracles at the first. Neither was it fit, as St Augustine³

¹ Acts viii. 12.

² Acts viii. 17.

³ "Cur, inquis, ista modo non fiunt? Quia non moverent, nisi mira essent; at si solita essent, mira non essent. Nam diei et noctis vices, annorum quadrifariam conversionem, decidentes redeuntes que frondes arboribus, infinitam vim seminum, pulchritudinem lucis, colorum, sonorum, odorum, saporum que varietates, da qui primum videat atque sentiat, cum quo tamen loqui possimus, hebescit obruitur que miraculis; nos vero hæc omnia non cognoscendi facilitate, quid enim causis horum obscurius, sed certe sentiendi assiduitate contemnimus.

noteth, that these miraculous courses should still have continued. For even as a man that never had seen the seed cast into the earth, and there rotting, and the trees dead in winter, after reviving, and flourishing again in their appointed time, would wonder no less at it, than if he should see a blind man receive sight, or a dead man life; but now that these things are ordinary, we little esteem them: so if those miraculous things appearing in the apostles, and first ministers of Christ which with their newness and strangeness moved much at the first, should have been continued still, they would have grown into contempt, and not have been regarded at all.

All that which hath been said touching the dignity apostolical, and the things properly pertaining to it, is so clear and evident, that wise and judicious men make no question of any part thereof. Yet are there some that seem to doubt whether the apostles generally had immediate calling, or universality of commission, supposing that Peter only was immediately designed by Christ, and the rest by him; that he only had an illimited commission, without all restraint, and the rest an inferior commission to that of Peter, bounded and stinted.

Touching the first of these doubts, Bellarmine¹ (whose

Facta sunt igitur illa opportunissime, ut his multitudine credentium congregata atque propagata, in ipsos mores utilis converteretur auctoritas.—August. *De Utilitate Credendi*. cap. 16. [Tom. viii. col. 68.]

¹ *Quæstio est, an episcopi canonice electi accipiant a Deo suam jurisdictionem, sicut eam accipit summus pontifex, an vero a pontifice. Sunt autem tres hac de re theologorum sententiæ. Prima eorum qui volunt tam apostolos quam cæteros episcopos immediate a Deo accepisse et accipere jurisdictionem. Altera est eorum qui volunt apostolos non a Christo sed a Petro, et episcopos non a Christo sed a Petri successore accepisse vel accipere jurisdictionem. Tertia est media eorum qui volunt apostolos quidem a Christo accepisse immediate omnem suam auctoritatem, tamen episcopos non a Christo sed a summo pontifice eam accipere; . . . quæ sententia verissima est, et ideo breviter confirmanda.*

“Quod igitur apostoli acceperint a Christo immediate suam jurisdictionem, primum testantur verba Domini, Joan. xx. : ‘Sicut misit me pater, et ego mitto vos.’ Quem locum sic exponunt patres Chrysostomus et Theophylactus, ut aperte dicant, factos esse his verbis apostolos Christi vicarios, immo ipsum Christi officium et auctoritatem accepisse.

“Addit Cyrillus in hunc locum, his verbis proprie apostolos creatos

manner it is not to conceal the divisions and differences that are or have been amongst the friends and lovers of the church of Rome, but to write them in the forehead of every controversy) showeth that there are three opinions amongst the divines of the Romish Church touching this point. The first, that as well the apostles, as succeeding bishops, received their power and jurisdiction from Peter, and his supposed successor the bishop of Rome. The second, that both apostles and bishops received their ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction immediately from Christ, and not from Peter nor his successors. The third, that bishops receive their jurisdiction from the pope, but that the apostles received all their power and jurisdiction immediately from Christ, and not from Peter. The second of these opinions is wholly true, and I will in due place confirm the same. The third, in part true, and in part false, which Bellarmine followeth: and the first wholly false, which he largely and substantially confuteth; proving first¹, that the apostles received all their jurisdiction and power immediately

esse apostolos, et orbis totius doctores; et ut intelligeremus, in apostolica auctoritate contineri omnem potestatem ecclesiasticam, ideo adjecisse Christum, 'Sicut misit me pater,' siquidem pater filium misit summa potestate præditum. Cyprianus lib. de Unit. Eccles. 'Loquitur,' inquit, 'Dominus ad Petrum: Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum; et eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit, Pasce oves meas. Et quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, et dicat, 'Sicut misit me pater, et ego mitto vos;' tamen, ut unitatem manifestaret, unam cathedram constituit, &c. Ubi vides, idem dari apostolis per illa verba, 'Ego mitto vos,' quod Petro fuerat promissum per illud, 'Tibi dabo claves:' et postea exhibitum per illud, 'Pasce oves meas.' Constat autem per illa, 'Tibi dabo claves,' et per illud, 'Pasce oves,' intelligi jurisdictionem plenissimam, etiam exteriorem. Quomodo autem hæc non impediunt Petri primatum, alibi satis ostendimus.

"Secundo, idem ostendit electio Matthiæ in apostolatam. Nam, Act. i. legimus, Matthiam apostolum non fuisse ab apostolis electum, nec datam ei ullam auctoritatem, sed implorata divinitus et impetrata electione ejus mox inter apostolos annumeratum. Certe si apostoli omnes a Petro habuerunt jurisdictionem, in Matthia maxime id ostendi debuisset.

"Tertio, probatur ex Paulo, qui ex professo docet, se auctoritatem ac jurisdictionem habuisse a Christo, et inde probat se verum esse apostolum."—Bellarm. De Romano Pontifice. Lib. iv. cap. 22, 23. [Tom. i. pp. 429, 30.]

¹ Ibid. cap. 23.

from Christ, and not from Peter, as well out of the words of our Saviour, when he saith: "As my Father sent me, so send I you¹:" as out of the election of Matthias², who was not chosen by Peter, or the other apostles, but designed immediately by God himself, showing by direction of the "lot falling on Matthias," that it was he whom he would have to succeed into the void room of Judas the traitor: adding, that the apostles gave him no authority; and that Paul professeth the same touching himself³, protesting that he received all his power and jurisdiction immediately from Christ, and thereby proving himself to be an apostle. Secondly, he proveth, that the fulness of all ecclesiastical power was committed to all the apostles, in as large and ample sort as to Peter, by the testimonies of Chrysostom and Theophylact: and that Christ by those words, "As my Father sent me, so send I you," made all the apostles his vicars or vicegerents, yea, gave them his own office and authority: and out of Cyril, that by these words he made them apostles and doctors of the whole world: and that to let them know, that in apostolic power he gave them all ecclesiastical power, he said unto them, "As my Father sent me, so send I you;" it being certain that the Father sent the Son with all fulness of power. Farther, he addeth out of Cyprian⁴, that the same fulness of power was given unto the rest of the apostles by those words, "As my Father sent me, so send I you," that was promised to Peter by those, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and performed by those other, "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs." "Now," saith he, "it is certain that by those words, 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' and by those other, 'Feed my sheep,' &c., is understood all fulness of jurisdiction both inward and outward: therefore the fulness of ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction was given to every one of the apostles." Thus then the cardinal confesseth, first, that all the apostles were immediately taught of God, without learning anything of Peter, or needing in anything to be confirmed by him. Secondly, that their commission was general; so that there was not any act of ecclesiastical ministry to which their commission did not extend, nor any places in

¹ John xx. 21.

² Acts i. 16.

³ Gal. i. and ii.

⁴ Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. [p. 107. Oxon. 1682.]

which, nor persons towards whom, they might not perform the acts of their ministry. Thirdly, that they received all this authority and power immediately from Christ, and not from Peter, and that therefore they could neither be limited, nor wholly restrained by him in the use and exercise of the same. Thus doth he overthrow the whole frame and fabric of their building, who ground the pretended supremacy of the pope upon Christ's words spoken to Peter. For to what purpose do they urge, that to Peter only Christ said, "Feed my sheep," &c.? That to him only "he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and upon him only promised "to build his Church"? Seeing they are forced to confess, that the commission of feeding Christ's sheep was given in as ample sort to the rest as to Peter; that they all received the whole power of the keys; that the Church was builded upon the rest as well as upon Peter, and equally founded upon them all.

If the cardinal shall shrink from this his confession, we can easily force him to it again, and make him acknowledge, that whatsoever Christ promised, intended, or performed, by any of his speeches directed unto Peter, he performed to all. Christ said specially to Peter, "Feed my sheep:" yet had the rest (our adversaries being judges) the same commission. He promised to him "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," so that "what he should bind on earth, should be bound in heaven;" he named him Peter, and promised "upon that rock to build his Church:" yet all received the same keys as well as he, the same power of binding and loosing, and the Church was equally builded on them all. These things I will particularly confirm and prove: and, first, that all the apostles had the same commission of feeding the flock of Christ that Peter had, it is evident. For whereas there are but four kinds of feeding, *Vita exemplari, subsidio corporali, doctrina salutari, et disciplina regulari*¹; that is, "By exemplary conver-

¹ "Spiritualiter pascere oves non contingit nisi tripliciter, scil. salutari doctrina, et vita exemplari, et disciplina seu correctione regulari."—Ockam. Dialog. Part I. Lib. v. cap. 15. [Apud Goldast. Monarch. S. Rom. Imp. Tom. II. p. 484.]

"Per verbum pascendi non solum importatur pascere alios verbo et exemplo, ac subsidio corporali, sed etiam potestative et cum auctoritate."—Id. Part III. Tract. 1. Lib. IV. cap. 10. [p. 857.]

sation, by ministering things necessary for the entertainment of this present life, by wholesome doctrine, and by regular discipline and government;" all these ways the rest of the apostles stood bound to feed the flock of Christ, as well as Peter. For they were all the "lights of the world¹," and their "light was so to shine before men, that they seeing their good works, might glorify their Father in heaven²;" they were all to take care of the poor and needy; they had all power to preach and minister sacraments by Christ's own warrant, saying unto them all, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost³," and to govern and guide the Church and people of God as well as Peter; Christ sending them as his Father sent him, and assuring them that "whose sins they remit, they are remitted, and whose sins they retain, they are retained." Neither can this be doubted of, seeing Bellarmine himself confesseth, in the place before alleged, that in the apostolic power all power and jurisdiction ecclesiastical, as well inward as outward, was contained: so that, that which Bellarmine and other papists insist upon, that Christ commended all his sheep unto Peter's care and charge, in that he said unto him, "Feed my sheep⁴," without any limitation or distinction, as if in this respect they would show us some singular thing in Peter's feeding of the flock of Christ not found in others, is too silly. For who knoweth not that every apostle had general commission, and that howsoever, for the better despatch of the work they had in hand, they divided amongst them the several provinces of the world, yet this was, as Bellarmine himself confesseth, *Provinciarum, non jurisdictionis divisio*⁵: that is, "A division of provinces, not of jurisdiction;" for there was not any of them but had power

¹ Matt. v. 14.

² Matt. v. 16.

³ Matt. xxviii. 19.

⁴ "Sunt autem hæc verba: 'Simon Joannis, pasce oves meas:' in quorum verborum explicationem tria demonstranda sunt. Primum soli Petro dictum esse, 'Pasce oves meas.' Deinde verbo illo 'Pasce' traditam esse summam ecclesiasticam potestatem. Postremo, illis vocibus 'Oves meas' universam Christi ecclesiam esse designatam."—Bellarm. ubi supr. cap. 14. [p. 278.]

⁵ "Respondeo divisionem, de qua Paulus loquitur in epist. ad Gal., non esse jurisdictionis, sed provinciarum, ad commodius prædicandum Christi evangelium."—Ibid. cap. 16. [p. 281.]

to preach, minister sacraments, and exercise discipline where-soever they would; one of them no way hindering the employment of another, but all with joint care seeking to set forward the work they had in hand. Yea, this is so clear, that the cardinal ingenuously confesseth it to be so, saying in express words, that “the rest of the apostles were heads, rulers, and pastors of the universal Church¹.”

Touching the power of the keys promised to Peter, and the “power of binding and loosing,” it will easily appear that no singular thing was either promised or given unto him, but that which was common to him with the rest. Thomas Aquinas² fitly observeth, that in corporal things the key is an instrument that openeth the door, and giveth entrance to him that formerly was excluded. Now the door of the kingdom of heaven is shut against us by sin, both in respect of the stain of it, and the guilt of punishment: whence it cometh, as he aptly noteth, that the power by which this stop and impediment is taken away is named the key. This power is in the divine Trinity principally, and by way of authority, in that God only taketh away sin, *dimittendo, quæ facta sunt; adjuvando, ne fiant; et perducendo ad vitam, ubi omnino fieri non possunt*; that is, “By forgiving the sin that is past; by helping the sinner, that he doth not the like again; and by bringing him to that life where he can sin no more.” And

¹ “Omnes fuerunt capita, rectores, et pastores ecclesiæ universæ, sed non eodem modo quo Petrus.”—Ibid. cap. 11. [p. 271.]

² “Respondeo dicendum quod in corporalibus clavis dicitur instrumentum quo ostium aperitur: regni autem ostium nobis per peccatum clauditur, et quantum ad maculam, et quantum ad reatum poenæ, et ideo potestas qua tale obstaculum removetur dicitur clavis. Hæc autem potestas est in divina Trinitate per auctoritatem, et ideo dicitur a quibusdam quod habeat clavem auctoritatis, sed in Christo homine fuit hæc potestas ad removendum prædictum obstaculum, per meritum passionis, quæ etiam dicitur januam aperire. Et ideo dicitur, secundum quosdam habere claves excellentiæ. Et quia ex latere Christi dormientis in cruce sacramenta fluxerunt, ex quibus ecclesia fabricatur, ideo in sacramentis ecclesiæ efficacia passionis manet, et propter hoc etiam ministris ecclesiæ, qui sunt dispensatores sacramentorum, potestas aliqua ad prædictum obstaculum removendum est collata, non propria sed virtute divina et passionis Christi, et hæc potestas metaphorice clavis ecclesiæ dicitur, quæ est clavis ministerii.”—Thomas Aquinas. Supplement. ad tertiam partem Summæ. Quæst. xvii. Art. 1. [Fol. 15, B. Ven. 1594.]

therefore the blessed Trinity is said to have the key of authority. Christ had power to remove this stop and hinderance by the merit of his passion, by instituting sacraments, and making them effectual instruments of the communication of his grace, for the taking away of sin; and therefore he is said to have the key of excellency. In men there is a ministerial power to remove the impediment of sin, that hindereth from entering into heaven, and therefore they are rightly said to have a key of ministry, which is two-fold: of science, and of jurisdiction. Of science, *removendo ignorantiam, et inducendo ad conversionem*; that is, "By removing the blindness of heart that is found in men, and inducing them to convert and turn to God;" of jurisdiction, in receiving men into the society of holy ones, and in admitting those that they think meet and worthy to the participation of the holy sacraments, in which the efficacy of Christ's passion communicateth itself; as also in rejecting the unholy and unclean. The jurisdiction of the Church is rightly signified metaphorically by the name of a key, because the chief command in a house or city is in him to whom the keys of that house or city are committed; and he that hath the keys hath thereby power to admit and receive into the house or city whom he will, and to exclude and shut out whom he pleaseth. And therefore when princes enter into their cities and towns, the citizens are wont to offer unto them the keys thereof, thereby acknowledging that the chief power and command of those places doth rest in them. Whereupon when the Lord promised to Eliakim, son of Hilkiah, servant of king Hezekiah, chief authority in the king's court, and in the city of Jerusalem, he said by his prophet, "I will give the key of the house of David upon his shoulders. He shall open, and no man shall shut: he shall shut, and no man shall open¹." In which sense also it is said in the Revelation of Christ, that "He hath the key of David; that he openeth, and no man shutteth: that he shutteth, and no man openeth²;" that is, hath all fulness of power in his Father's house and kingdom. Thus then the key of ministry being only the power of teaching, instructing, admonishing, comforting, governing, and yielding sacramental assurances of God's mercy and grace, by dispensing the sacraments Christ hath instituted; and this power being the same in Peter and the

¹ Isaiah xxii. 22.

² Rev. iii. 7.

rest ; it is clear that “the keys of the kingdom of heaven” were equally committed unto them all.

The force of these keys is not only expressed by the acts of opening and shutting, but of “binding and loosing” also, thereby to show that they are no material keys, but metaphorically understood, and spiritual; and that heaven is then opened unto men that they may enter into it, when they are loosed from their sins that hindered them from entering in thither. And hereupon it is that Christ, having promised the keys of the kingdom of heaven to blessed Peter, telleth him likewise, that “what he shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and what he shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.” The bonds wherewith men are bound on earth are of four sorts. First, of laws, obliging and tying them to the performance of certain duties. Secondly, of sins. Thirdly, of punishments to be inflicted by Almighty God; and fourthly, of punishments to be inflicted by men. The bond of laws is of two sorts. For there are divine laws, and there are human laws. God bindeth men to the doing of what he pleaseth; and men that are in authority, either civil or ecclesiastical, to such things as they think fit. Touching these bonds, none have power to loose but they that have power to bind: so that what God by precept bindeth us to do, none but God can free us from the necessity and duty of doing it; and what the Church or magistrate bind us to, no inferior power can loose us or free us from. Loosing, in this sense opposed to binding by law and precept, is in two sorts: by revocation, and by dispensation. Revocation is an absolute abrogation of a law in respect of all places, times, persons, and conditions, and that either by express and direct repeal, or by general neglect and long-continued disuse. Dispensation is in respect of certain persons, times, places, and conditions of men and things; so that a dispensation permitting the law to retain her wonted authority, only freeth some particular person or persons, at some times, in some places, and in some condition of things, from the necessity of doing, or leaving undone, that which unless it be in consideration of such particular circumstances, the lawgiver meant should be observed, but in such cases not so.

Here the question is moved by occasion of that kind of loosing which is by reversing laws formerly in force, whether

God the giver of the moral law may revoke the same, and dispense with men for the not doing of things there prescribed, or the doing of things there forbidden. The answer is¹, that these laws are imposed upon men by the very condition of their nature and creation; as the very condition and nature of a man, created by God, requireth that he should honour, love, fear, and reverence him that made him: and therefore touching the precepts of the first table (that concerning the Sabbath excepted) it is clear and evident, that they cannot be altered, nor man by God himself discharged from the duty of honouring, loving, and fearing God so long as he hath any being. Touching the precepts of the second table, it is resolved, that God cannot dispense with man, or give him leave to do the things therein forbidden, as to steal, murder, or lie. For all these imply and involve in them that which is simply evil, and to be disliked: but by some alteration in the doer, or matter of action, he may make that not to be evil, that otherwise would be evil, and consequently not forbidden; as namely, that to be no theft or murder, which otherwise would be; as when he commanded the Israelites to spoil the Egyptians, they did not commit the act of robbery; for robbery is the taking away of a thing from the owner against his will: but these things which the Israelites took away, were the Egyptians' no longer, after God the supreme Lord, had spoiled them of the title they had thereunto, and assigned the same to the Israelites. So likewise for one man to take away the life of another, having no authority so to do, is murder, and no man can be dispensed with lawfully to do any such act; but for a magistrate to take away the life of an offender, is a lawful act, and no act of murder; and so, if Abraham had slain his son Isaac, it had not been murder, being authorized so to do by God, who hath supreme authority in the world, and may justly, as a judge, for sin found in men, take away the lives of whom he pleaseth, and as supreme and absolute Lord, bring all to nothing that for his will's sake he made of

¹ "Deus potest passim dispensare in ceremonialibus, et judicialibus sive sacramentalibus, et talibus positivis: nullo autem modo in primis principiis juris naturalis. Observantia sabbati ceremonialiter accepta dispensabilis erat: immo et revocata est per Christum: sed prout moralis et naturalis nunquam per Christum."—Petrus de Palude, in 3 Sent. Dist. XL. Quæst. 3. [fol. 241. Par. 1517.]

nothing, though there were no sin nor fault at all. But touching ceremonial, judicial, and positive laws of God concerning sacraments and observations of what kind soever, seeing they are imposed after and upon the being of nature, we think that God may alter them at his pleasure, so that at one time it may be lawful to do that was forbidden at another. The governors that God hath set over his Church and people by commission from him, may interpret what is doubtful in these laws of God, or in those of the other sort; but yet according to the law: but they may not abrogate or dispense with any law of God, either natural and moral, or positive, established concerning the use of sacraments, and things pertaining to God's worship and service. But concerning those laws that were made by the apostles and primitive fathers, touching matters of outward observation, the succeeding guides of the Church may either dispense with them, or reverse them upon the due consideration of the difference of times, men, and things. And so we see to whom it pertaineth to bind men with their laws, and to loose them from the bonds thereof.

The bond of sin, which is the second kind of those bonds I mentioned, is two-fold; for there is *vinculum captivitatis*, and *vinculum servitutis*¹; that is, a man that is a sinner, is so bound, that he can neither return to do good, nor leave off to do evil: for sin holdeth him in a bond of captivity, that he shall not return to do good; and with a bond of servitude, that he shall not cease to do evil. And though God hath so ordered the nature of man, that he who will do evil shall thus be entangled; yet it is man that thus entangleth, wrap-peth, and bindeth himself, and not God. But for the bond of eternal condemnation, and the punishments following evil-doers, which is the third kind of those bonds wherewith I showed that men are tied and bound, it is of God. From these bonds of sin and punishment inflicted by God, none but he alone can free men by his favour, and the work of his grace, as the supreme and highest cause, none but Christ by merit and satisfaction. The ministers of the Church, by the ministry of the word and sacraments, may convert men

¹ "Culpæ obligatio versatur circa duo. In uno accenditur vinculum captivitatis, in alio debitum servitutis."—Richard. de Sancto Victore, De Potestate Ligandi et Solvendi, cap. 2. [Part. i. p. 340. Ven. 1592.]

to God instrumentally, making them partakers of his graces, and bringing them into such an estate, wherein they shall be sure for Christ's sake to find mercy with God, for the remission and taking away of their sins. They may pray for them, and out of the knowledge of their estate assure them of remission: but other power to unloose and untie these direful and horrible bonds of sin and punishment, they have none: only the punishments which they have power to inflict, they have authority to diminish, lessen, or take away; so that whom they bind with the bonds of ecclesiastical censures and punishments, those by the same authority they may unloose. For as the guides of God's Church may prescribe, enjoin, and impose certain actions of mortification, and penitential conversion unto God: so when they see cause, they may release from the same: as by excommunication they may restrain from the use of sacraments, society of believers, and benefit of the Church's prayers; so by absolution they may free from all these bonds again. Neither is this kind of binding and loosing lightly to be esteemed of, or little regarded: for he that for his contempt and disobedience is debarred from the use of the sacraments, from enjoying the society of the believers, and partaking in the benefit of the Church's prayers, is undoubtedly excluded from all access to the throne of grace in heaven, and all acceptation there; and so consequently no less bound in heaven than in earth: and he that is unloosed from these bonds on earth, is unloosed and set free in heaven, that without all restraint he "may go boldly to the throne of grace, to seek help in the time of need¹."

Thus we see the divers kinds of binding and loosing, and that the guides of God's Church have power and authority by laws and precepts, censures and punishments, to bind those that are committed to their care and trust; and when they see cause, by reversing such laws and precepts, wholly or in part, and by diminishing, releasing, and taking away such censures and punishments, to untie them, and set them free again. The bond of divine laws they may no otherwise meddle with, than by letting them know who are so bound, how straitly they are tied. The bonds of sin, and punishments by divine justice to be inflicted, they have no

¹ Heb. iv. 16.

power and authority to unloose, but they concur as helpers to the unloosing of them, by the ministry of the word winning and persuading men to convert unto God, to cast their sins from them, and by the sacraments instrumentally communicating unto them the grace of repentant conversion, and the assurance of remission and pardon.

In all these kinds of binding and loosing the apostles were equal; seeing (our adversaries themselves confessing) they had the same power of order and jurisdiction in like extent, within the compass whereof all these kinds of binding and loosing are confined. Wherefore let us proceed to speak of the power of remitting and retaining sins, given to the apostles by Christ our Saviour. To remit sin properly is nothing else but to resolve not to punish sin, and therefore he only may properly be said to remit sin that hath power to punish it. Now as sin is committed against the prescript of God, our conscience, and men in authority; so God, the conscience of the sinner, and the magistrate, and minister, have power to punish sin: God, with punishments temporal and eternal, of this life and that which is to come; the conscience, with remorse; the magistrate, with death, banishment, confiscation of goods, imprisonment, and the like; and the guides of the Church, with suspension, excommunication, degradation, and such other censures. Hence it followeth, that God only is said properly to remit the punishments that his justice doth inflict; that the conscience only, upon repentance, can take away that bitter and afflictive punishment of remorse, wherewith she is wont to torment and disquiet the mind of the offender; and that the magistrate and minister only have power to take away those punishments that in their several courses they may and do inflict. Notwithstanding, the minister by the word persuading men to repentance, procuring remission, and out of his prudent observation of the party's conversion unto God, assuring him that it will go well with him, as also by the sacrament instrumentally communicating to him as well the grace of repentant conversion, as of free remission (that so he may hear the very sound and voice of God in mercy, saying to the heart and spirit of the repentant sinner, "I am thy salvation"), may be said in a sort to remit sin, even in that it is an offence against God, not by way of authority and power, but by winning and per-

suading the sinner to that conversion which obtaineth remission from God, and by the sacrament instrumentally making him partaker as well of the grace of remission of sin from God, as of conversion from sin to God. There are but four things in the hand of the minister, the word, prayer, sacraments, and discipline. By the word of doctrine he frameth, winneth, and persuadeth the sinner to repentant conversion, seeking, and procuring remission from God. By prayer, he seeketh and obtaineth it for the sinner. By sacraments, he instrumentally maketh him partaker as well of the grace of remission as conversion: and by the power of discipline, he doth by way of authority punish evil doings, and remit or diminish the punishments he inflicteth, according as the condition of the party may seem to require. By that which hath been said, it appeareth that to bind and loose, to remit and to retain sins, are equivalent and the same: save that to bind and loose, is of more ample and large extent, in that it implieth in it the binding by precepts and laws, and the loosing which is by reversing or dispensing with the same. And therefore having showed that the apostles were equal in the power of binding and loosing, we need add no farther proof that they were equal in power of remitting and retaining sins.

Wherefore let us proceed to the promise of Christ made to Peter, that upon the rock mentioned by him, he "would build his Church," and let us see whether any peculiar thing were promised unto Peter in that behalf. The Church of God, we know, is compared in scripture to a city, an house, and a temple; and therefore the beginning, proceeding, and increasing of the same, is rightly compared to building. Now in building there must be a foundation upon which all may rest and stay that is put into the same building; and the foundation must be sure, firm, and immoveable; for otherwise it will fail, and so all other parts of the building, wanting their stay, will fall to the ground. Now nothing is so firm, sure, and immoveable, as a rock, and consequently no building so strong as that which is raised upon a rocky foundation: whereupon our Saviour sheweth that a "house builded on the sand is easily ruined¹," and soon shaken to pieces; but that an "house builded upon a rock standeth firm," notwith-

¹ Matt. vii. 24, &c.

standing the fury and violence of the floods, winds, and tempests : and compareth a man rightly grounded, and established in his persuasion and resolution, to an house so built. By a rock therefore in this place is meant a sure foundation, that will not fail, nor be moved or shaken, how great a weight soever be laid upon it. In a foundation there are three things required. The first is, that it be the first thing in the building : the second, that it bear up all the other parts of the building : and the third, that it be firm and immovable. For as Christ saith, “If the eye that is the light of the body be darkness, how great is that darkness¹!” so, if that which is to support and bear up all, do fail and shrink, all must needs be shaken, and fall asunder. These being the things required in a foundation ; simply and absolutely, in respect of all times, persons, and things, Christ only is that foundation upon which the spiritual building of the Church is raised, because he only is that beginning whence all spiritual good originally floweth, and cometh, upon whom all the persuasion of the truth of things revealed stayeth itself, as being the “Angel of the great Covenant,” and that eternal “Word,” that “was with God in the beginning,” upon whom all our hope, confidence, and expectation of any good groundeth itself : “all the promises of God being in him yea and Amen².” And in this sense the apostle St Paul saith, “Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ³.” And St Augustine⁴, and other of the

¹ Matth. vi. 23.² 2 Cor. i. 20.³ 1 Cor. iii. 11.

⁴ “Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra, sicut non Christus a Christiano, sed Christianus a Christo vocatur. Ideo quippe ait Dominus, ‘Super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam,’ quia dixerat Petrus, ‘Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi.’ Super hanc ergo, inquit, petram quam confessus es ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Petra enim erat Christus.”—August. In Joann. Evang. Tract. cxxiv. cap. 21. [Tom. III. Part. 2. col. 822.]

“Hoc autem ei nomen, ut Petrus appellaretur, a Domino impositum est, et hoc in ea figura, ut significaret ecclesiam. Quia enim Christus petra, Petrus populus Christianus. Petra enim principale nomen est. Ideo Petrus a petra, non petra a Petro : quomodo non a Christiano Christus, sed a Christo Christianus vocatur.”—Id. De Verbis Domini, Serm. XIII. [Al. Serm. LXXVI. Tom. v. col. 415, f.]

“Dixi in quodam loco de apostolo Petro, quod in illo tanquam in petra fundata sit ecclesia ; qui sensus etiam cantatur ore multorum in versibus beatissimi Ambrosii, ubi de gallo gallinaceo ait, ‘Hoc ipsa

fathers understand by that rock upon which our Saviour promised Peter to build his Church, the rock that Peter confessed, which rock was Christ, upon which foundation even Peter himself was builded; for that "other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." But in respect of some particular times, persons, and things, and in some particular and special considerations, there are other things that may rightly be named foundations also, in respect of the spiritual building of the Church. So in respect of the frame and fabric of virtue and well-doing raised in this building, the first virtue, namely faith, upon which all other virtues do stay themselves, and from which they take the first direction that any virtue can give, is rightly named a foundation. In respect of the form of Christian doctrine, the first principles of heavenly knowledge are rightly named a foundation: "Not laying again," saith the apostle, "the foundation of faith, and of repentance from dead works, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of the imposition of hands, of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment, let us be led forward unto perfection¹." These first principles of heavenly knowledge are named a foundation, because they are the first things that are known, before which nothing can be known; and because upon the knowledge of these things all other parts of heavenly knowledge do depend. In respect of the confession of the true faith concerning Christ, the first clear, express, and perfect form of confession that ever was made concerning the same, may rightly be named a foundation, and in this sense Peter's faith and confession is by divers of the fathers² named the Church's foundation. But they under-

petra ecclesiæ canente culpam diluit. Sed scio me postea sæpissime sic exposuisse quod a Domino dictum est, 'Tu es Petrus, et supra hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam;' ut super hunc intelligeretur quem confessus est Petrus dicens, 'Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi:' ac sic Petrus ab hac petra appellatus personam ecclesiæ figuraret quæ super hanc petram ædificatur, et accepit claves regni cælorum. Non enim dictum est illi, 'Tu es petra,' sed, 'Tu es Petrus.' Petra autem erat Christus, quem confessus Simon, sicut eum tota ecclesia confitetur, dictus est Petrus. Harum autem duarum sententiarum quæ sit probabilior, eligat lector."—Id. *Retract.* Lib. i. cap. 21. [Tom. i. col. 32.]

¹ Heb. vi. 1.

² "Firmitas fundamenti cui totius ecclesiæ superstruitur altitudo nulla incumbentis sibi templi mole lacessit. Soliditas enim illius fidei

stand not by the faith and confession of Peter, either the virtue and quality of faith abiding in his heart and mind, or the outward act of confessing, but the form of confession made by him when he said "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God¹:" upon which form, as being the rule of all right believing, the Church of God is builded. In respect of the supernatural knowledge of God in Christ, the first and immediate revelation made to the apostles, from whom all other were to learn, and by whose ministry, accompanied with all things that might win credit, they were to be gained unto God, may very rightly and justly be named a foundation, upon which the faith of all after-comers is to stay itself, and from which in all doubts they must seek resolution. And in this sort Bellarmine² saith truly, that the apostles may be named Foundations of the Church, according to that de-

quæ in apostolorum principe est laudata, perpetua est; et sicut permanet quod in Christo Petrus credidit, ita permanet quod in Petro Christus instituit."—Leo, In annivers. Assumpt. Serm. II. [Al. III. Tom. I. col. 12. Ven. 1753.]

¹ Matth. xvi. 16.

² "Quemadmodum hoc loco Petrus dicitur fundamentum ecclesiæ, sic alibi dicuntur omnes apostoli fundamenta. Psalm lxxxvi.: 'Fundamenta ejus in montibus sanctis:' id est, ut exponit Augustinus, in apostolis et prophetis. Et Apocal. xxi.: 'Et murus civitatis habens fundamenta duodecim, et in ipsis duodecim nomina duodecim apostolorum agni.' Et Ephes. ii.: 'Superædificati super fundamentum apostolorum et prophetarum.' Quibus verbis alludens B. Hieronymus lib. in Jovinian. i.: 'Sed dicis,' inquit, 'super Petrum fundatur ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes apostolos fiat, et ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur. Nihil igitur proprium et singulare Petro datum vel promissum est.' Respondeo tribus modis apostolos omnes fuisse ecclesiæ fundamenta, sine ullo tamen Petri præjudicio. Uno modo, quia ipsi primi ecclesias ubique fundarunt, nec enim Petrus convertit ad fidem totum orbem terrarum.

"Altero modo dicuntur fundamenta ecclesiæ apostoli et prophetæ ratione doctrinæ a Deo revelatæ. Si quidem fides ecclesiæ nititur revelatione, quam habuerant a Deo apostoli et prophetæ: nec enim semper revelantur ecclesiæ novi articuli, sed in ea doctrina ecclesia acquiescit, quam apostoli et prophetæ a Domino didicerunt, et prædicatione vel literis ad posteros mandaverunt. Tertio modo dicuntur fundamenta omnes apostoli, ratione gubernationis. Omnes enim fuerunt capita, rectores, et pastores ecclesiæ universæ, sed non eodem modo quo Petrus: illi enim habuerunt summam atque amplissimam potestatem ut apostoli seu legati, Petrus autem ut pastor ordinarius; deinde

scription in the Revelation of St John, of the wall of the city of God, that “had twelve foundation-stones upon which it was raised, and in them written the names of the Lamb’s twelve apostles¹;” and that of St Paul, that “we are builded upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus being the head corner-stone².” And this in three respects. First, because the apostles were the first that founded Churches, and converted unbelievers to the faith. Secondly, because their doctrine, which they received immediately from God by most undoubted revelation, without mixture of error, or danger of being deceived, is the rule of the faith of all after-comers; and that sure, immoveable, and rocky foundation, upon which the persuasion of all succeeding generations and posterities may and doth most securely stay and ground itself. Thirdly, because they were heads, guides, and pastors of the whole universal Church, having not only supreme, but prime and original government of the same, out of whose most large and ample commission all ecclesiastical power and authority of after-comers was in an inferior degree and sort to be derived and taken. In all these respects all the apostles were that strong rock, and those strong rocky foundation-stones, on which the Church is builded, though in a peculiar sense Christ alone be the rock: and in all these respects, as St Hierome saith, *Super omnes ex æquo Ecclesiae fortitudo solidatur*³: that is, “the strength and firmness of the Church doth equally and indifferently stay itself upon them all;” and consequently no more upon Peter than any of the rest. Hitherto we find nothing peculiar to Peter, and not common to all the apostles: so that all the allegations of our adversaries touching the feeding of the sheep of Christ committed to Peter, the power of the keys, of binding and loosing, of remitting and retaining sins, and the promise that on him, as on a rocky foundation-stone elect and precious, Christ would build his Church, are to no purpose, seeing they are forced to confess that all these things were likewise, either by direct words, or by intendment, bestowed

ita habuerunt plenitudinem potestatis, ut tamen Petrus esset caput eorum, et ab illo penderent, non e contrario.”—Bellarm. De Romano Pontifice, Lib. I. cap. 11. [Tom. I. p. 271.]

¹ Rev. xxi. 14.

² Ephes. ii. 20.

³ Hieron. Contr. Jovinian. Lib. I. [§ 26. Tom. II. col. 279.]

on all the rest¹. Wherefore let us see how notwithstanding this their confession they can make good that there was a primacy of power in Peter, and how they go about to confirm the same.

CHAPTER XXIII.

OF THE PRIMACY OF POWER IMAGINED BY OUR ADVERSARIES TO HAVE BEEN IN PETER, AND THEIR DEFENCE OF THE SAME.

FOR the avoiding of the clear evidence of the truth of all that which hath been said, touching the equality of the apostles of Christ amongst themselves (which our adversaries cannot but see, and acknowledge), they have two shifts: the first², that the apostles were equal towards the people, but not amongst themselves: the second³, that they were equal

¹ "Scimus quod Petrus nihil plus potestatis a Christo recepit aliis. . . . Et quanquam Petro dictum est, 'Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram,' tamen per petram Christum quem confessus est intelligimus. Et si Petrus per petram tanquam lapis fundamenti ecclesiæ intelligi deberet, tunc ita similiter alii apostoli fuerunt lapides fundamenti ecclesiæ. Et si Petro dictum est, 'Pasce oves,' tamen manifestum est quod illa pascentia est verbo et exemplo. . . . Ideo recte dicimus omnes apostolos in potestate cum Petro æquales."—Nicolaus de Cusa, Concord. Cathol. Lib. II. cap. 13. [p. 726. Bas. 1565.]

² "Omnes apostolos atque episcopos pascendi mandatum a Christo accepisse verum est, sed omnimoda et æqualis potestas pascendi qualis Petro nulli alii data est.

"Ratione jurisdictionis magis extensæ archiepiscopus ab episcopo et summus pontifex ab utroque differt; sicut omnis episcopus etiam ratione potestatis ordinis magis extensæ a simplici presbytero differt. Rursum, unusquisque episcopus in solidum est episcopus respective, id est, respectu subditorum suorum, pro quorum animabus ipse est redditurus rationem complete et in solidum, ideo que et eas docendi corrigendi, &c., potestatem habet completam, etsi subordinatam ad unitatis conservationem."—Stapleton. Relect. Controv. III. Quæst. 1. Art. 1. [Tom. I. p. 676. Par. 1620.]

³ "Apostoli inter se sunt comparati dupliciter. Primo in quantum apostoli, et sic omnes fuerunt æquales. Alio modo in quantum oves Christi ab eo hic corporali conversatione separatæ et sic Petrus solus est pastor, et reliqui apostoli oves sub illius cura.

in the apostolic power, but that Peter had that amplitude of power (which the rest had as apostles by special favour, and only in and for their own persons) as an ordinary pastor, and in such sort that he might leave the same to his successors. These their silly shifts and evasions we will examine, that so the truth of that which hath been said be more fully cleared, and that all men may see and perceive that nothing can be substantially objected against it, nor no evasion found to avoid it.

Touching the first thing that they say, it is an axiom, as I think, that may not be doubted of, that "whatsoever things are equal in respect of a third thing, are in the same sort and so far forth equal amongst themselves." So that if the apostles were equal in the respect they had to the people, and as governors of the same, they were so far forth and in that respect equal amongst themselves. But they will say, perhaps, that the apostles were indeed equal amongst themselves in the power and office of teaching, directing, guiding, and governing the Christian world, but that yet amongst themselves there was an inequality, and one was superior and had power over the rest, not in respect of the acts of their office of teaching and governing the world, but in respect of their personal actions. This surely is one of the strangest paradoxes that ever was heard of. For who can imagine that God would trust the apostles with the managing of the weightiest affairs of his Church, and the government of the whole world, without being any way accountant in respect thereof unto any one amongst them as superior, and that he would appoint an head and chief, and subject them to his censure in their personal actions? Nay, this is impossible, and cannot be. For if in their office of teaching and governing the rest of the Church they were equal, and could not therein be limited or restrained one by another, then was there none amongst them that could put any of the rest from his office, dignity, and employment.

Now it is most clear and certain, that he who hath not power to suspend another from the execution of his office in

"*Petrus ex propria sui pontificatus officii auctoritate gubernabat, alii vero apostoli ex privilegio domini delegantis eis gubernationis officium.*"—Thomas de Vio Cajetanus, *Opusc.* Tom. I. Tract. I. cap. 3. [fol. 4. Ven. 1594.]

the Church, hath no power to suspend him from the sacraments, or to excommunicate him, whatsoever his personal misdemeanours be. For as to be a minister of the Church presupposeth to be a member of it, so to be put from being a member of the Church implieth and presupposeth a putting from all office and dignity in the Church; so that there neither was nor could be any amongst the apostles that had power to put any of the rest out of the Church, or to suspend them from the use of the sacraments, seeing there was none found amongst them that had authority to limit, restrain, or debar any of the rest from the execution of his office: and therefore all that any one of them could do in respect of another, was but to admonish him; and upon his rejecting of such admonitions, to refuse to communicate with him; which thing any one may do in an absolute equality, as well as when one is superior to another; as we see by the example of Paul reproving Peter¹, and resisting him to his face, and likewise by that of Paul and Barnabas² parting the one from the other upon such dislikes and differences as grew between them.

Wherefore, I suppose, our adversaries will not much insist upon this their first shift and evasion. Let us see, therefore, if their second be any better. It is true (say they) that all power ecclesiastical, and all degrees of the same are included and implied in the apostolic office and dignity; that the apostles, as apostles, were all equal; and consequently that there was no one amongst the apostles but in his time had as much to do in governing of the Church as Peter, without receiving anything from him, or being any way subject to his control, and to be restrained, limited, or directed by him. But this amplitude of power which all the apostles had in common, the rest had only for themselves, and as a personal privilege that was to end with them; but Peter had the same in such sort that he might leave it to his successors. So that that power which in the rest was apostolic and temporary, and to end with them, was ordinary, pastoral, and perpetual in Peter, and to be derived from him to his successors and after-comers. Surely this second evasion will be found much worse than the first: for it is absurd to say that Peter left all the dignity and ecclesiastical power he had in common with the rest of the apostles to his successors; for then all popes

¹ Gal. ii. 11.

² Acts xv. 39.

should be immediately chosen by God, not by the cardinals; then should they all be consecrated and ordained immediately by Christ, not by bishops; then should they all see Christ in the flesh; then should they all have power to write books of Canonical Scripture, and be free from danger of erring whenever they either preach or write; for so the apostles were: yea, then should they confirm their doctrine by miracles, and give the Holy Ghost by imposition of their hands. Whereas yet no pope dareth challenge any one of these pre-eminences. If they say that all the dignity and power that was in the apostles was not ordinary, pastoral, and perpetual in Peter, and so to be passed over to his successors, but some part of it only, it is just nothing they say: for then this is all that they affirm, that some part of that dignity and power that was in Peter is in Peter's successors, and so there is in the silliest priest in the world.

But they will say, immediate vocation, the seeing of Christ in the flesh, infallibility of judgment, power to write Canonical books of Scripture, and the confirmation of doctrine by miracles, together with the giving of the Holy Ghost by imposition of hands, were fitting to the first beginnings of Christianity, and not of perpetual necessity and use, and therefore to cease after things were established; but that universality of jurisdiction, and a kind of infallibility of judgment, are perpetually necessary, and therefore these were to pass from Peter to others, though the rest of the apostolic pre-eminences were not. Thus then first they amplify the excellent dignities of Peter, as if the rest had not had the like; but being convinced that he had nothing the rest had not, they make show as if they would prove that the apostle St Peter had all those things in such sort that he might leave them to his successors, which the rest had as personal privileges only; because he is described to be a pastor of the Church, in that Christ saith unto him, "Feed my sheep¹," and the office of a pastor is of perpetual necessity. But being urged, that there are many excellent dignities found in Peter and the rest that are not communicable to any other, as immediate vocation, seeing of Christ in the flesh, absolute infallibility in word and writing, speaking in diverse tongues, power to do miracles, and power to give the visible gifts of the Holy Ghost by the im-

¹ John xxi. 16.

position of hands; they confess that precisely Peter's being a pastor of the Christian Church will not prove that any dignity of his mentioned in the Scripture is perpetual, pastoral, and to continue for ever, unless the necessity of the perpetuity of it be made to appear otherwise. Whence it will follow, that they cannot prove that any special pre-eminences in Peter which he had in common with the rest, as namely, infallibility of judgment, and universality of jurisdiction, were pastoral and perpetual in him, and to be passed from him to his after-comers, and thereby entitle the pope unto them: for Peter's being a pastor, which is the only thing they can allege to prove that what he had was pastoral and perpetual, proveth it not; and the proof of the necessity of the continuance of any pre-eminence found in Peter and the rest of the apostles, sheweth that such a pre-eminence must continue, but not in what person or persons it must continue.

But let us see whether infallibility of judgment, and universality of jurisdiction, be amongst the things that were proper to the beginnings of Christianity, or amongst those that are perpetually necessary. Surely, touching the first, Bellarmine¹ seemeth to confess, that the being taught immediately of God, and the being absolutely free from error, so that their writings and sayings were canonical, were temporary in the apostles, as necessary only in those first beginnings of Christianity; and whether he confess it or not, it is most undoubtedly true, that that absolute infallibility that was in Peter, for whose faith Christ prayed that it might not fail, was temporary, and not to be communicated to any after-comers: for he was so led into all truth, that he could not err in any of his writings and preachings; whereas all confess, that even popes may err in both these, and that they are free from error only when they determine those things wherein the whole Church seeketh their resolution. Touching the second, which is universality of jurisdiction, the same cardinal hath these words: *Fuit in illis Ecclesiæ primordiis*

¹ "Respondeo, in apostolatu tria contineri. Primo, ut qui apostolus est sit immediatus verbi minister, ita ut ab ipso Deo doctus sit, et sacros libros scribere possit, et hoc fatemur non convenire in Romanum pontificem; non enim necesse est ut quotidie novæ revelationes habeantur, et novi libri sacri scribantur."—Bellarm. De Romano Pontifice, Lib. II. cap. 12. [Tom. I. p. 313.]

*necessarium ad fidem in toto orbe terrarum disseminandam, ut primis prædicatoribus et Ecclesiarum fundatoribus summa potestas et libertas concederetur*¹; that is, “in those first beginnings of the Church it was necessary, for the quick dispersing of the faith throughout the whole world, that the first preachers and founders of Churches should have a most ample power and free commission, without that straitening and limitation of the same that is in their after-comers, that so every one of them might truly use those words of the apostle, *Instantia mea quotidiana sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum*², that is, ‘My daily instance is the carefulness of all Churches:’ or, as some others translate it, ‘I am cumbered daily, and have the care of all Churches.’ And therefore howsoever the apostles divided amongst themselves the several parts of the world, to which each one of them should more specially preach the word of the Lord; yet did they not shut up and inclose their cares within the bounds and compass of any one province, but every one of them did so take care of the whole Church, as if that care had pertained unto him alone.” Thus far Bellarmine, clearly confessing that the illimited commission of the apostles was fitted to those first beginnings of Christianity, and the condition of those first times; so that the same reason that excludeth the other dignities and pre-eminences of the apostles, as namely their being fitted to the first beginnings, excludeth both these from being perpetual likewise.

But let us let this advantage go, and take a view of those proofs which they bring of the power of Peter’s successors above other bishops, whereas Peter himself had no power more than any of the rest. It is true (say they) that Peter had no power which the rest had not, but he had that amplitude of ecclesiastical power as an ordinary pastor, which they had only as apostles and delegates by special favour and personal privilege. Against this distinction few of our divines say anything, many of them confessing they understand it not; so deep is the learning of our adversaries, that every man cannot be so happy as to understand what they write. Which is the less to be marvelled at, seeing many of them scarce understand themselves, and yet condemn us as if we were silly idiots.

¹ Id. Lib. i. cap. 9. [Tom. i. p. 266.]

² 2 Cor. xi. 28.

But if without offence we may conjecture what the meaning of this their riddle is, surely under correction I think this it is. The rest of the apostles had as great authority and power, and as large a commission as Peter had ; but they had it only for term of life, and could leave none to succeed them in the same : he had it for himself, and such as he would leave it unto. Besides, he was first invested with all the plenitude of ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction, so that none could have anything to do in this business but such as should receive commission from him, save only that Christ reserved power to himself to give commission to such as by special favour he should be pleased to honour, as were the apostles separated to the work of the ministry by his own immediate designment, without receiving anything from Peter : but afterwards all were either to receive of him, or of them to whom he should leave his office and charge. This their conceit they illustrate by a similitude. A bishop, say they, hath authority to preach in his diocese, as pastor of the place, and whosoever succeedeth him in his bishoply office, succeedeth him in the same power likewise. A friar by special favour from the pope may preach in the same diocese wheresoever the bishop may, and cannot be silenced or restrained by him, because he received nothing from him, but his superior the pope ; but another desiring to succeed the friar, not so favoured and privileged by the pope, must fetch his commission and allowance from the bishop, and be subject to him in the performance and execution thereof. So here Peter was first constituted pastor of all the world ; the apostles were by special favour authorized immediately by Christ to preach in Peter's charge, and to govern the Church whereof he was bishop as well as he ; but yet so that all they that were to follow after, were to derive their commission from Peter or his successor, if they would meddle in the Church which was his charge. Many things are said by Cajetan, Bellarmine, Stapleton, and others, to this purpose ; but this is the substance of all : wherefore let us see how they prove that they say.

Touching the first of these two points, thus they prove it. Peter was a pastor, and had that amplitude of illimited commission before described, as a pastor : but the office of a pastor is of perpetual necessity and use ; and therefore this his illimited power and commission was to be perpetually con-

tinued. That Peter was a pastor they prove, because Christ said unto him expressly, "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs." This is the frame of their whole building, which may very easily be thrown to the ground, if any man will put his hand unto it. First, because it is certain that the other apostles were pastors also; so that if Peter's being a pastor prove the necessity of the continuance of those ample pre-eminences he had, and that he might leave them to whom he pleased, it would follow, that the rest of the apostles also had their pre-eminences, which were equal with those of Peter, not as things temporary, but perpetual, and such as they might leave to whom they pleased. That the other apostles were pastors, first the hymn of the Church¹, wherein they are expressly said to have been constituted pastors by Christ, proveth. Secondly, the confession of Bellarmine², acknowledging that what was given to Peter by those words, "Feed my sheep," was given unto all by those other words, "As my Father sent me, so send I you," confirmeth the same. And thirdly, the enumeration of the several kinds of feeding, every of which the divines do show to agree to the rest as well as to Peter, demonstrateth that they were all pastors. Secondly, whereas they say, that the office of a pastor is a thing of perpetual use and necessity, and consequently perpetual, and that the amplitude of power which was in Peter agreed unto him in that he was a pastor, and as a pastor, they bewray notable ignorance and folly. For it is true, indeed, that the office of a pastor is of perpetual use and necessity, and so to

¹ "Testatur autem prædictis quod ecclesia catholica cantat de omnibus apostolis indifferenter: 'Vere dignum et justum est, æquum et salutare, te Domine suppliciter exorare, ut gregem tuum pastor æterne non deseras, sed per beatos apostolos tuos continua protectione custodias, ut eisdem rectoribus gubernetur quos operis tui vicarios eidem contulisti præesse pastores.'"—Ockam. Dialog. Part. III. Tract. 1. Lib. 4. cap. 3. [Apud Goldast. Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp. Tom. II. p. 849. Francof. 1614.]

² "Quod igitur apostoli acceperint a Christo immediate suam jurisdictionem, primum testantur verba Domini, Joann. xx.: 'Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos.' Quem locum sic exponunt patres, Chrysostomus et Theophylactus, ut aperte dicant, factos esse his verbis apostolos Christi vicarios, immo ipsum Christi officium et auctoritatem accepisse."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. IV. cap. 23. [Tom. I. p. 430.]

continue for ever ; but the amplitude of power and jurisdiction, and the great pre-eminences that were in Peter, did not agree unto him as to a pastor, or in that he was a pastor ; for, if they had, then must they agree to every pastor, and so every bishop must have the same, and not the pope only. For as whatsoever agreeth to a man, in that he is a man, agreeth to every man ; so whatsoever agreeth to a pastor, in that he is a pastor, agreeth to every one that is a pastor. If they shall say, that the great and ample pre-eminences that were in Peter did not agree unto him as a pastor, but in some other respect, then his being a pastor, which is an office of perpetual necessity, use, and continuance, will not prove the same perpetual, no more than other things which this pastor had, in that he was an apostle. If they shall say, These things agreed unto him, not in that he was a pastor, but in that he was such a pastor as was to feed the flock of Christ and people of God, by delivering unto them the doctrine of truth without all mixture of any the least error, to confirm the same by miracles following, and to give the visible gifts of the holy Spirit by the only imposition of his hands ; it is true that they say : but such a pastor they confess is necessary only in the beginnings of the Christian Church, and not afterwards ; and therefore from thence it cannot be concluded that the ample pre-eminences that were in Peter, as his infallibility of judgment and illimited commission, were to be passed over from him to his successors and after-comers. Their second conceit is more fond than the first : for if Peter were by Christ constituted sole supreme pastor and bishop of the whole universal world, and yet his meaning was, that others should likewise receive immediately from himself power to do as much in the governing of the Church as Peter, he meant to give him something, and presently to take it from him again. For as if the pope shall make a man bishop of such a city or country, and thereby give unto him that supreme direction that nothing shall be done within that compass without his authority and consent, and shall presently send another with full authority to do anything that the former may do, and no way to be subject to his control or restraint in the performance thereof, or accountant for it, he revoketh and maketh void his first grant ; so here, if Christ make Peter supreme bishop, and pastor of the whole Christian world, and

presently constitute eleven other apostles, with power and commission to do anything that Peter may do, in all parts of the world, and towards all persons (which as they have not from him so he cannot take it from them, or limit them in the use of it), he absolutely voideth his first grant made to Peter.

But they will say, perhaps, that Christ meant little favour to Peter more than to one of the rest of the apostles, but that all his care was for the good of the pope, whom he meant to make a great man in the world; and that therefore he constituted the other apostles immediately as well as Peter, put them into equal commission with him, and would not have them beholden to him for any honour or power they had, but appointed that all other bishops should receive their mission, calling, commission, and authority, from Peter, during the short time of his life, and after his departure, in all succeeding ages to the end of the world, from his successors, the bishops of Rome. This, truly, is well said in favour of the pope, if it were as truly said as it is kindly meant; but we shall find that there is no truth in that they say. For it is clear and evident, that each apostle by his commission he had from Christ, without being any way beholden to Peter for it, had authority to preach the Gospel to such as never heard of it before, to plant Churches, and ordain and constitute in them pastors and bishops, and out of his more large and ample commission to make other, though somewhat more restrained and limited; whence it will follow, that they whom any of the other apostles ordained and constituted pastors and bishops, which were innumerable in all parts of the world, received nothing from Peter nor his pretended successor. Now they whom the apostles thus constituted and ordained, might constitute and ordain other by virtue of their office and calling they had from the apostles, and those other, other again to succeed them, so that none of these to the end of the world, one succeeding another, should ever receive anything from Peter or his pretended successor. And therefore it is absurd that Bellarmine¹ saith, that the apostles received all

¹ "Vides idem dari apostolis per illa verba, 'Ego mitto vos,' quod Petro fuerat promissum per illud, 'Tibi dabo claves,' et postea exhibitum per illud, 'Pasce oves meas.' Constat autem per illa, 'Tibi dabo claves,' et per illud 'Pasce oves,' intelligi jurisdictionem plenissimam etiam exteriorem. Quomodo autem hæc non impediunt Petri

their jurisdiction immediately from Christ, and that yet notwithstanding all bishops receive the same from the pope. And those papists are better advised that say, that the bishops of other Churches receive not their jurisdiction from the pope, but from Christ, by those apostles that constituted their Churches, and planted their predecessors in the same, setting them the bounds of their bishop-like charge: whence it will follow (as Bellarmine wisely foresaw, and therefore declined this opinion) that the pope cannot either take away or diminish their authority, unless any man can show where Christ gave him power to limit, restrain, or take away that power from men, which they have from himself by the hands of the other apostles and their after-comers, without being any way beholden to Peter for the same.

Wherefore they have yet one more strange conceit behind to help the matter than any of those we have hitherto heard; which is, that Peter being not only an apostle, but supreme pastor and bishop of the whole world constituted by Christ, made the other apostles bishops and pastors; and that they ordained bishops, not by virtue of their apostolic power (which they received immediately from Christ, without being beholden to Peter for it, or inferior to him in it), but by virtue of their bishoply authority and office which they received from Peter. *Alioqui enim, saith Bellarmine¹, cum omnes apostoli plurimos episcopos in variis locis constituerint, si apostoli ipsi non sint facti episcopi a Petro, certe maxima pars episcoporum non deducit originem suam a Petro*; that is, "For otherwise, seeing all the apostles constituted exceeding many bishops in diverse places, if the apostles themselves were not made bishops by Peter, certainly the greatest part of bishops will not fetch their original from Peter." This his fancy of Peter's making the other apostles bishops, immedi-

primatum alibi satis ostendimus."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 23. [Tom. i. p. 430.]

"Quod vero omnis ordinaria jurisdictio episcoporum a papa immediate descendat, probatur, primo ex figura testamenti veteris, . . . secundo, regimen ecclesiasticum est monarchicum, &c. Si haberent episcopi a Christo auctoritatem suam, non posset Christi vicarius eam tollere, et minuere; vel dicant adversarii, ubi Dominus ita subjecerit episcopos pontifici, ut voluerit etiam illa posse mutari quæ ipsemet eis contulerit."—Id. cap. 24. [p. 431.]

¹ De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. c. 23. [Ibid.]

ately after, as his manner is, like an honest man, he contradicteth, confessing that the apostles were all bishops, and the first bishops of the Church, in that they were apostles without any such ordination. *Omnes apostoli*, saith he¹, *fuerunt episcopi, imo etiam primi episcopi Ecclesiæ, tametsi non sunt ordinati*: that is, "All the apostles were bishops, nay, which more is, the first bishops of the Church, without any other or new ordination, besides their apostolic mission and calling." And, in another place², he pronounceth peremptorily, that by virtue of these words, "As my Father sent me so send I you³," the apostles were made vicars of Christ, nay, that they received the very office and authority of Christ, and that in the apostolic power all ecclesiastical power is contained; and though in the former place he said expressly, *Non eo ipso quod aliquis est apostolus est episcopus*; that is, "A man is not therefore a bishop because an apostle;" for the twelve were apostles before they were either bishops or priests: yet in the latter place he saith, it is not to be marvelled at that they were apostles before the passion of Christ, and yet neither priests nor bishops: for that the Lord at diverse times gave the apostles diverse kinds and degrees of power; but especially in the twentieth of John, perfected that he began before his passion. So that an apostle perfectly constituted and authorized hath both priestly and episcopal dignity and power, though in the beginning, when the apostles were rather designed than fully constituted, not having received their full commission, they were neither priests nor bishops. But to leave Bellarmine lost in these mazes, it is most easy demonstratively to prove, that the apostles, in that they were apostles perfectly and fully constituted, had both priestly and bishoply dignity and power in most eminent sort. For did not Christ give the apostles power to do any ecclesiastical act that a bishop can do? Did he not give them power to preach and baptize, when he said unto them, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them⁴," &c.: to minister the holy eucharist, when he said, "Do this, as oft as ye shall do it, in remembrance of me⁵?" Did he not give them the power of the keys, of

¹ Ibidem.² Lib. iv. cap. 23.³ John xx. 21.⁴ Matt. xxviii. 19.⁵ Luke xxii. 19.

binding and loosing, of remitting and retaining sins, and, consequently, all that cometh within the compass of ecclesiastical office and ministry? doubtless he did: neither is there any that dareth to deny any part of that which hath been said. And therefore it is an idle fancy, that Peter made the rest of his fellows bishops, the apostolic power implying in it eminently episcopal, as the greater the lesser.

But they will say, Peter made James the lesser bishop of Jerusalem. Indeed, Baronius¹ falsifieth Chrysostom, and maketh him say, that the doctor of the world made James bishop of Jerusalem: whereas he saith no such thing; but asking the question why Peter, whom Christ so much favoured, was not preferred to be bishop of Jerusalem, answereth, that Christ made him doctor of the world, which was a greater honour than to have been fastened to the church of Jerusalem, and to have been set in the episcopal throne there. But it is clear by the testimonies of antiquity, that Peter, James the greater, and John, ordained James bishop of Jerusalem. So saith Anacletus in his second epistle, if any credit be to be given unto it, where he hath these words: "A bishop must be ordained of three bishops, as Peter, James the greater, and John, ordained James the lesser bishop of Jerusalem." Clemens Alexandrinus² also, as we read in Eusebius, saith the very same; and Hierome, *De Viris Illustribus*³, attributeth the ordaining of James not to Peter alone, but to the apostles. His words are, *Jacobus, statim post passionem Domini, ab Apostolis Hierosolymorum episcopus ordinatur*: that is, "James presently after the passion of the Lord is ordained bishop of Jerusalem by the apostles."

¹ "Chrysostomus, Si quis, inquit, a me percontaretur quomodo Jacobus sedem Jerosolymitanam accepit, responderem ego hunc totius orbis magistrum præposuisse Petrum."—Baron. Annal. an. Christi. 34. [§ 286. Tom. i. p. 238. Antwerp. 1612.]

"Εἰ δὲ λέγει τις, πῶς οὖν ὁ Ἰάκωβος τὸν θρόνον ἔλαβε τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων; ἐκεῖνο ἂν εἴποιμι ὅτι τοῦτον οὐ τοῦ θρόνου ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐχειροτόνησε διδάσκαλον."—Chrysost. Hom. LXXXVII. in Joann. [Al. LXXXVIII. Tom. VIII. p. 527, B.]

² "Πέτρον, φησι [Κλήμης], καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὡς ἂν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου προτετιμημένους, μὴ ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἐλέσθαι."—Clem. Alex. apud. Euseb. H. E. Lib. II. cap. 1.

³ Hieron. De Viris Illustr. in Jacob. [Cap. 2. Tom. II. col. 815.]

If any man ask how the apostles did ordain or make James being an apostle a bishop, if the apostolic office imply in it the office and dignity of a bishop, as the greater the lesser; we answer, that a bishop differing from an apostle, as in other things, so in this, that he is fixed to some certain place whereof specially he taketh the care, whereas the care and employment of an apostle is more at large; when the apostles after the conversion of nations and people began to retire themselves to certain places there to rest, and specially to take care thereof, they were in that respect rather bishops than apostles; and in this sort James the lesser being appointed by the apostles to make his principal abode at Jerusalem, a chief city of the world, whence the faith spread itself into all other parts, and more specially to take care thereof, is rightly said to have been constituted bishop of that place by them, not as if they had given him any new power and authority that he had not before, or not in so perfect a sort, but that they limited and restrained him more specially to one certain place where he should use the same.

The place in the Acts¹ maketh nothing for the confirmation of the popish error: for Paul and Barnabas formerly designed by Christ to be apostles, were again by the ministry of prophets revealing the will and pleasure of Almighty God, separated more specially to be apostles of the Gentiles, and put forth into that employment with fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands: not thereby receiving any new power, but a special limitation and assignation of those parts of the world wherein principally they should be employed. Besides, these were not apostles, but prophets, such as Agabus was, that are mentioned in this place, inferior in degree to apostles, and such as might not make an apostle to be a bishop, but did only signify and reveal what the will of God was, and whither he meant to send these worthy apostles, and so with prayer and fasting commended them to the grace of God; and therefore this place maketh nothing for proof of Peter's ordaining and appointing the rest of the apostles to be bishops.

¹ Acts xiii. 2, 3.

CHAPTER XXIV.

OF THE PRE-EMINENCE THAT PETER HAD AMONGST THE APOSTLES, AND THE REASON WHY CHRIST DIRECTED HIS SPEECHES SPECIALLY TO HIM.

THAT there was no more power and authority in Peter than in any of the rest, I hope it appeareth by that which hath been said: and therefore it remaineth that now we examine, what was the reason why so many things were specially spoken to him, why so many ways he may seem to have been preferred before the rest, and what in truth and in deed his pre-eminence, and primacy was. Touching the speeches of Christ for the most part specially directed to Peter, it is most certain by that which hath been said, that they did give no singular and special power to Peter that was not given to every of the rest.

And therefore the divines¹ do observe the difference of the speeches of Christ, and note that Christ sometimes directed his speech to particular men precisely in their own persons, as in the remission of sins, healing the sick, and raising the dead: sometimes in the person of all, or many others, as when

¹ "Interroganti vero cur Christus hoc Petro singulariter dixerit, dicendum utique est, quod Christus quandoque sermonem dirigebat in personam propriam, ut in remissione peccatorum, sanatione infirmorum, et suscitatione mortuorum; quandoque dirigebat sermonem ad alterum in personam omnium aut plurium, ut Joh. v.: 'Vade et amplius noli peccare, ne deterius tibi contingat;' unde idem officium Christus committendo Petro ille loquebatur in persona omnium apostolorum, sicut ipsemet testatur hunc modum loquendi suum Matt. xiii. cum dixit, 'Quod uni ex vobis dico omnibus dico.' Specialiter tamen ad Petrum direxit sermonem quia senior erat, vel quia charitate ardentior, vel ut significaret ecclesiæ futuræ quales debeant pastores institui. Quoniam ætate maturi, ex qua signatur prudentia seu scientia. Et charitate pleni, ex qua significatur cura et diligentia quas debent habere pastores. Aut fortasse ne videretur tanquam abjectior relinqui, quia Christum negaverat. Quod sapere videtur glossa, cum dicit, 'Trinæ negationi redditur trina confessio, ne minus amor lingua serviat quam timori.' Hoc enim certissime constat quod omnibus Matt. ult. dictum est indifferenter, 'Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes,' nec dixit Petro, vade et alios mitte, in quo signavit omnibus auctoritatis æqualitatem."—Ockam. Dial. Part. III. Tract. 1. Lib. IV. cap. 3. [Apud Gollast. Monarch. S. Rom. Imp. Tom. II. p. 849.]

he saith, "Go, and sin no more¹," which he is intended to have done so often as there is the same reason of speaking a thing to one and to others; as when a man is induced to do or not to do a thing, to believe or not to believe a thing, which other in like sort are bound to do or not to do, to believe or not to believe, as well as he. So it being as necessary for one to watch as another, Christ saith, "That I say unto you I say unto all, Watch²." And so here, seeing it is confessed and proved by our adversaries themselves, that there was nothing promised or performed by Peter that was not in like sort intended unto and bestowed on every of the rest, it must be granted, that what he spake to him he meant to all, and would have his words so understood and taken. The reason³ why more specially, notwithstanding this his general intendment, he directed his speech to Peter than to any of the rest, was either because he was more ancient and more ardent in charity than the rest, thereby to signify what manner of men they should be that should be chosen pastors of the church, namely, men of ripe age and confirmed judgment, and full of charity: or lest he might seem to be despised for his denial of Christ, which the gloss seemeth to import when it saith, *Trinæ negationi redditur trina confessio, ne minus amorì lingua serviat, quam timori*; that is, "Therefore he was induced by Christ thrice solemnly to protest and profess his love unto him, as he had thrice denied him, that his tongue might show itself no less serviceable unto love that rested in him, than it had done unto fear:" or else because he first confessed Christ to be the Son of the living God consubstantial with his Father, because he was much conversant with Christ, and acquainted with his secrets and counsels; or lastly, because Christ meant there should be a certain order amongst the guides of his church, and some to whom the rest in all places should resort in all matters of importance, as to such as are more honourable than other of the same rank and degree who are first to be consulted, from whom all actions must take their beginning; therefore he so specially spake to Peter, whom he meant in this sort to set before the rest. Thus then there is a primacy of power when one hath power to do that act of ministry another hath not, or not without

¹ John v. 14.

² Mark xiii. 37.

³ Ockam, ubi supra.

his consent; and when one may by himself limit, restrain, or hinder another in the performance of the acts of ministry: and such primacy we have showed not to have been in Peter. But there is another of order and honour which he had, whereby he had the first place, the first and best employment, the calling together of the rest in cases where a concurrence of many was required (as for the better sorting out of the work they had in hand, the joint decreeing of things to be everywhere alike believed, and practised), and in these assemblies thus called, the sitting and speaking first, the moderation and direction of each man's speaking, and the publishing and pronouncing of the conclusion agreed upon, if so he pleased. In this sense Cyprian¹ saith, *Erant utique et cæteri apostoli quod fuit et Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur*; that is, "The other apostles doubtless were that which Peter was, having the same fellowship both of power and honour; but the beginning proceedeth from unity, that the church may be showed to be one." And in the same sense Hierome saith against Jovinian², "Thou wilt say, the Church is founded upon Peter: it is true it is so, and yet in another place the same frame of the Church is raised upon all the apostles; and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the firmness of the Church stayeth itself equally upon them all; but therefore doth Christ more specially promise to build his Church upon Peter, that he being constituted and appointed head and chief amongst them, all occasion of schism might be taken away." To the same purpose it is that Leo writeth to Anastatius³, where he saith, *Inter beatissimos apostolos in similitudine honoris fuit quædam discretio potestatis, et cum omnium par esset electio, uni tamen datum est, ut cæteris preemineret*; that is, "Amongst the most blessed apostles like in honour, there was a certain difference of power; and

¹ Cyprian. De Unit. Eccles. [p. 107. Oxon. 1682.]

² "At dicis super Petrum fundatur ecclesia: licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant, et ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur; tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio."—Hieron. advers. Jovinian. Lib. i. [§ 26. Tom. ii. col. 279.]

³ Leo, Epist. LXXXIV. [Al. Epist. xiv. cap. ii. Tom. i. col. 691. Ven. 1753.]

when all were equally elected, yet it was given to one to have a pre-eminence amongst the rest." In which saying of Leo, that it be not contrary to that of Cyprian, who saith, that the apostles were companions, and consorts equal both in honour and power, we must not understand that one apostle had more power than another, or that power another had not; but that in the same power one was so before the rest, that he was the party to whom they were to resort, and without consulting whom first and before all other, they might attempt nothing generally concerning the state of the whole church by virtue of this power. In which sense he saith in another place¹: *Petro præ cæteris solvendi et ligandi tradita est potestas*; that is, "The power of binding and loosing was so given to Peter, that therein he was before the rest;" and again, *Siquid cum eo commune cæteris Christus voluit esse principibus, nunquam nisi per ipsum Petrum dedit quicquid aliis non negavit*²: that is, "If Christ would have anything to be common to the rest of the princes, that is, apostles, with Peter, he never gave that which he vouchsafed unto them any otherwise than as by Peter:" which words must not so be understood, as if Peter had first received the fulness of power, and others from him; for all the apostles received their power and commission immediately from Christ, and not from Peter, as I have largely proved, and all confess: but that what he gave to others, it did so pass unto them, as that in the first place it was given to Peter, and he thereby set in order and honour before the rest put in the same commission with him; so that Peter received not a different or more large commission from Christ than the other apostles, but only a kind of honourable precedence, pre-eminence, and priority, such as the duke of Venice hath amongst the great lords of that state, to whom all embassies and messages are directed from foreign princes, and in whose name all letters, warrants, and mandates are sent out, as representing the whole state; yet can he do nothing without the rest, nor cross the consenting resolution of those noble senators.

And in this sense it is that Augustine³ saith of Peter, that

¹ Leo, Epist. LXXXIX. [Al. Epist. x. Tom. i. col. 635.]

² Id. In annivers. Assumpt. Serm. III. [Tom. i. col. 16.]

³ "Quod ad ipsum proprie pertinet natura unus homo erat, gratia unus Christianus, abundantiore gratia unus idemque primus apostolus,

he was by nature one particular man, by grace a Christian man, by more ample and abundant grace a chief apostle; but that when he received the keys, he represented the whole universal Church, not as a legate that representeth the person of his prince and receiveth honours, dignities and titles for him and not for himself, but as chief of the company of the apostles, receiving for himself in the first place that which in him and together with him was intended to them all. This primacy of honour and order found in blessed Peter¹, who is thereupon named by the fathers prince and head of the apostles, is the original of all that superiority that metropolitans have over the bishops of their provinces, and primates and patriarchs over metropolitans, and, in a word, of all that order that is in the Church, and amongst her guides, whereby unity is preserved.

CHAPTER XXV.

OF THE DISTINCTION OF THEM TO WHOM THE APOSTLES DYING LEFT THE MANAGING OF CHURCH-AFFAIRS: AND PARTICULARLY OF THEM THAT ARE TO PERFORM THE MEANER SERVICES IN THE CHURCH.

HAVING spoken of the apostles' power and office, and the largeness of that commission, it remaineth that we sed quando ei dictum est, 'Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum, &c.' universam significabat ecclesiam quæ in hoc sæculo diversis tentationibus velut imbribus, fluminibus, tempestatibus quatitur, et non cadit, quoniam fundata est super petram, unde Petrus nomen accepit.... Ecclesia ergo quæ fundatur in Christo claves ab eo regni cœlorum accepit in Petro, id est potestatem ligandi solvendi que peccata."—August. Tract. cxxiv. in Joann. [Tom. III. Part. 2. col. 822.]

¹ "Inter beatissimos apostolos in similitudine honoris fuit quædam discretio potestatis, et cum omnium par esset electio, uni tamen datum est ut cæteris præemineret. De qua forma episcoporum quoque est orta distinctio, et magna ordinatione provisum est, ut omnes sibi omnia vindicarent; sed essent in singulis provinciis singuli, quorum inter fratres haberetur prima sententia; et rursus quidam in majoribus urbibus constituti sollicitudinem susciperent ampliorem, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis ecclesiæ cura conflueret, et nihil usquam a suo capite dissideret."—Leo, Epist. lxxxiv. [Al. Epist. xiv. cap. II. Tom. I. col. 691.]

come to speak of them to whom they recommended the managing of church-affairs and the ministry of holy things when they left the world. They to whom they recommended the care of these things, when having finished their course they were called hence to receive the crown laid up for them in heaven, were of two sorts: first, such as they trusted with the ministry of the word and sacraments, and government of God's people; and secondly, such other as they appointed to be assistant to them, and to perform the meaner services, though necessary also.

The former sort are all comprehended under one common name of presbyters, that is, fatherly guides of God's Church and people; the latter are deacons, and such other inferior ministers as attend the necessities of the saints, and assist the principal guides of the Church. "In the ordination of a presbyter," saith Durandus¹, "there is a certain power conferred on him, and assigning of him to an employment, whereby after his ordination he may do something which he could not have done before, *etiam quoad genus facti*, no not in the kind and nature of the thing itself; as he that is ordained a presbyter, may consecrate the Lord's body, and absolve in the court of penitency; neither of which things without such ordination can be done: but to them that are

¹ "In ordinatione sacerdotis confertur potestas vel deputatio per quam ordinatus potest aliquid facere quod non poterat prius etiam quoad genus facti, sicut ordinatus in sacerdotem potest conficere corpus domini et absolvere in foro pœnitentiæ quod non poterat ante ordinationem, sed in ordinibus inferioribus sacerdotio nulla potestas vel deputatio confertur ordinato per quam possit aliquid facere interius vel exterius quod non poterat prius, sed solum per quam licet facere quod non licebat prius; quicquid enim potest diaconus ordinatus, puta legere evangelium, ministrare sacerdoti et cætera, totum poterat prius facere, sed non licebat ei, et similiter est de inferioribus ordinibus. Ergo cum potestas sit ad posse et non ad licere, potestas quæ confertur in aliis ordinibus a sacerdotio non est potestas simpliciter, sed secundum quid; nec illi ordines sunt ordines simpliciter cum ordo sit signaculum ecclesiæ mediante quo spiritualis potestas traditur ordinato, ut dictum fuit prius, quare nec sunt sacramenta simpliciter sed secundum quid sive quædam sacramentalia; . . . unde deputatio ad prædicta officia facienda videtur esse ab institutione ecclesiæ ad solennitatem divini cultus; ecclesia autem non habet instituere sacramenta, sed solum sacramentalia."—Durandus a Sancto-Portiano in 4 Sent. Dist. xxiv. Quæst. 2. [fol. 311, B. Par. 1550.]

in the inferior orders there is no power given, neither have they any assignment to do anything which they could not do before, and without such ordination, but to do such things as they could not lawfully do; nay in many of them there is no designment of them that are so ordained to the performance of anything, but that which, according to the use of the universal Church, men without such ordination may lawfully do. So that the ordination of men to the performance of such things, and the execution of such offices, seemeth to have proceeded from the institution of the Church, for the greater solemnity of divine worship and service: and therefore such inferior orders are neither simply orders (order being a sacred sign or character by virtue whereof a power is given to the ordained, not only to do that he could not otherwise lawfully do, but to do that which otherwise he could not do at all), neither are they sacraments, but sacramental solemnities only, seeing the Church can institute no sacraments." Hitherto Durandus. These being the sorts of them to whom the apostles recommended the managing of church-affairs, and this the difference of their orders, I will first speak of the divers orders and degrees of them that perform the meaner services in the Church, and then come to speak of them that have the government of the Church.

The Master of Sentences¹ saith that the order of subdeacons, and other minor orders below the degree of deacons, as acoluthes, exorcists, lectors, and ostiaries, were brought in by the Church, and that they were not in the apostles' times; and Thomas Aquinas², and other, are of the same mind. Notwithstanding, there is no question but these minor orders and degrees were very ancient. For Cyprian³ maketh mention

¹ "Apostoli in singulis civitatibus episcopos et presbyteros ordinarunt. Levitas etiam ab apostolis ordinatos legimus, quorum maximus fuit beatus Stephanus. Subdiaconos vero et acolytos procedente tempore ecclesia sibi constituit."—Petrus Lombardus, Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. xxiv. cap. 8.

² "In primitiva ecclesia propter paucitatem ministrorum omnia interiora ministeria diaconibus committebantur. . . . Erant omnes prædictæ potestates, sed implicate in una diaconi potestate, sed postea ampliatus est cultus divinus, et ecclesia quod implicate habebat in uno ordine explicite tradidit in diversis."—Thom. Aquin. Addit. ad 3 Part. Summæ, Quæst. xxxvii. Art. 2. [fol. 32, f. Ven. 1594.]

³ "Exemplaria autem eadem nunc quoque per Mettium hypodia-

of one Mettius a subdeacon, and Nicephorus an acoluthē. In another place he writeth, that he had ordained Aurelius¹ and Celerinus lectors; and in a third place he mentioneth exorcists² and lectors. Cornelius, bishop of Rome, in his epistle recorded by Eusebius³, describing the clergy of the Roman church in his time, sheweth that there were in the same forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acoluthes, fifty-two exorcists, lectors, and ostiaries; widows, with distressed people, more than fifteen hundred. Ignatius⁴, in his epistle to the Antiochians, omitting acoluthes, reckoneth the rest, as subdeacons, lectors, ostiaries, and exorcists, adding to them cantores, and laborantes, or copiatæ, whose employment was to bury the dead; of whom also Epiphanius⁵ speaketh.

conum a me missum et Nicephorum acoluthum transmisi.”—Cyprian. Lib. II. Ep. 10. [Al. Epist. XLV. p. 88.]

¹ “Aurelius frater noster illustris adolescens. . . . merebatur talis clericæ ordinationis ulteriores gradus et incrementa majora, non de annis suis sed de meritis æstimandus; sed interim placuit ut ab officio lectionis incipiat.”—Id. Lib. II. Ep. 5. [Al. Epist. xxxviii. p. 74.]

“Hunc (Celerinum) ad nos, fratres dilectissimi, cum tanta Domini dignatione venientem, testimonio et miraculo ipsius qui se persecutus fuerat illustrem, quid aliud quam super pulpitum, id est, super tribunal ecclesiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celsitate subnixus, et plebi universæ pro honoris sui claritate conspicuus, legat præcepta et evangelium Domini quæ fortiter ac fideliter sequitur.”—Id. Lib. IV. Ep. V. [Al. Epist. xxxix. p. 76.]

² “Optamus te cum sanctis martyribus pacem habere. Præsente de clero et exorcista et lectore; Lucianus scripsit.”—Id. Lib. V. Ep. 14. [Al. Universi confessores ad Cyprianum, Epist. xxiii. p. 49.]

³ “Ὁ ἐκδικητὴς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐκ ἠπίστατο ἓνα ἐπίσκοπον δεῖν εἶναι ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἠγνοεῖ (πῶς γάρ;) πρεσβυτέρους εἶναι τεσσαράκοντα ἑξ, διακόνους ἑπτὰ, ὑποδιακόνους ἑπτὰ, ἀκολουθούς δύο καὶ τεσσαράκοντα, ἐξορκιστὰς δὲ καὶ ἀναγνώστας ἅμα πυλῶροις δυὸ καὶ πεντήκοντα, χήρας σὺν θλιβομένοις ὑπὲρ τὰς χιλίας πεντακοσίας, οὓς πάντας ἡ τοῦ Δεσπότης χάρις καὶ φιланθρωπία διατρέφει.”—Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. VI. cap. 43.

⁴ “Ἀσπάζομαι ὑποδιακόνους, ἀναγνώστας, ψάλτας, πυλῶρους, τοὺς κοπιῶντας, ἐπορκιστὰς.”—[Ignat. ad Antioch. § 12. Coteler. Tom. II. p. 107.]

⁵ “Εἰθ' ἐξῆς τούτων, ἐπορκισταὶ, καὶ ἐρμηνευταὶ γλώσσης εἰς γλώσσαν, ἡ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν, ἡ ἐν ταῖς προσομιλίαις· λοιπὸν δὲ καὶ κοπιαταὶ, οἱ τὰ σώματα περιστέλλοντες τῶν κοιμωμένων· καὶ θυρωροὶ, καὶ ἡ πᾶσα εὐταξία.”—Epiphan. in Epitome Doctr. Catholicæ. [Tom. I. p. 1104, Colon. 1682.]

Whereupon bishop Lindan¹ saith, that howsoever in these times they make or account but seven orders, yet in the primitive church there were more now scarce known. But let us see what the office, employment, and manner of the admission of these men was in former times. Touching ostiaries, the council of Carthage² ordaineth thus: "Let the ostiary after he hath been instructed by the archdeacon how to behave himself in the house of God, at the suggestion of the archdeacon be ordained, and let the bishop take the keys from the altar, and give them to him, saying: So demean thyself as being to give an account to God for the things that these keys lock up."

The lectors were to read in the church whatsoever was to be read out of the Old or New Testament; whereupon Cyprian³ having ordained Aurelius the confessor a lector, giveth a reason why he had so done: *Quia nihil magis congruit voci, quæ Dominum gloriosa prædicatione confessa est, quam celebrandis divinis lectionibus personare*: that is, "Because nothing doth more fit or better beseeem the voice that by a glorious public testimony hath confessed the Lord, than to give a sound in the church in reading the divine scriptures of the Lord."

The exorcists were such as took care of the energumens, or men vexed with the devil, who in ancient times came to the churches in great companies, and were there provided for, and kept under rules and disciplinary government. These exorcists received of the hands of the bishop the book wherein the exorcisms were written, which they were to commit to memory, that so by earnest invocation of the name of Christ, who is to return to judge the quick and the dead, and to

¹ "Etsi nunc temporis in septenos duntaxat differantur ordines, apud veteres tamen plures observavimus, hodie prope incognitos: qualis Fossorum fuit, Syngelorum et Archisyngelorum, Primiceriorum, Secundiceriorum, atque Defensorum."—Lindan. Panopl. Evang. Lib. iv. cap. 77. [p. 406, Colon. Agripp. 1575.]

² "Ostiarius cum ordinatur postquam ab archidiacono instructus fuerit, qualiter in domo Dei debeat conversari, ad suggestionem archidiaconi tradat ei episcopus claves ecclesiæ de altario, dicens: Sic age, quasi redditurus Deo rationem pro his rebus quæ his clavibus recluduntur."—Concil. Carthag. iv. [Can. 9. Labbe, Concil. Tom. ii. col. 1438.]

³ Cyprian. Lib. ii. Epist. v. [Al. Epist. xxxviii. p. 75.]

judge the world in fire, they might obtain of him the repressing of Sathan's furies, and the ease and deliverance of such as were disquieted and vexed by him. These had power to impose hands on them that were disquieted with devils, whether baptised or not; and in solemn manner to commend them unto God, who only hath power to rebuke Sathan.

Acoluthes were so named for that they were to follow and attend the bishop whithersoever he went, that so they might not only be witnesses of his blameless conversation, but do unto him such service as he should require and stand in need of; whereupon in later times, for that they were to go before the bishop in the churches, bearing wax-lights in the night-watches, and other meetings for divine service in the night-time, they were named Ceroferarii, that is, taper-bearers. Subdeacons were to assist the deacons in all things pertaining to them. The order of subdeacons in ancient time was not accounted a sacred order¹, so that they might not touch the sacred vessels, nor none might be chosen a bishop out of their rank; but the later bishops of Rome decreed, that the order of subdeacons should be reputed a sacred order.

These were the inferior orders of ministry in the church in ancient times, to which were added widows², or holy women, which being aged and destitute of friends, were maintained by the church; and being of good report, were chosen and appointed to minister to the women that were baptized, to teach and direct them how to answer the baptizer, and how to live afterwards, as also to take care of them that were sick.

¹ “Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτας ἔχειν χώραν ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ, καὶ ἀπτεσθαι δεσποτικῶν σκευῶν.”—Concil. Laodic. can. xxi. [“Quod non oporteat subdiaconos habere locum in diaconico, et Dominica vasa contingere.”—Vers. Dionys. Exig. Labbe, Tom. i. coll. 1533, 45.]

“Non oportet subdiaconos licentiam habere in sacrarium sive secretarium, quod Græci diaconium appellant, ingredi, et contingere vasa Dominica.”—Decret. Gratian. Part. i. Dist. xxiii. cap. 26. [col. 141.] vide etiam Dist. lx. cap. 4. [col. 377, Par. 1585.]

² “Viduæ et sanctimoniales quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres, tempore quo baptizandæ sunt, qualiter baptizatori interrogatæ respondeant, et qualiter accepto baptismate vivant.”—Concil. Carthag. iv. can. 12. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 1438.]

All these, as well ostiaries, lectors, exorcists, and acoluthes, as subdeacons, in ancient times served for a certain space in these degrees, and therefore the solemn designing of them thereunto was not to be disliked; but now, when they execute the office of ostiaries, who are no ostiaries; of lectors, who are no lectors; of psalmists, who are worthy to be driven not only out of the quire but out of the church also, as bishop Lindan¹ rightly noteth: when none of these perform the duties their names import, and every man almost is made a presbyter the first day, as if none might be made the next; it is but for show and fashion only that men are ordained to the performance of these offices, and in truth and in deed nothing else but a mere mockery, as the same bishop Lindan ingenuously confesseth. With whom Duarenus² agreeth: his words are: *Hodie nec diaconis nec aliis inferioribus clericis ullus locus est in ecclesia, ullumve ministerium aut munus quod exsequantur; sed quia priscis canonibus statutum est ut nemo presbyter ordinetur, nisi per omnes gradus inferiores ascenderit, ideo dicis causa, ut ita dicam, gradatim ordinari solent, idque certo quodam solennique ritu, ut ad honorem presbyterii aut quemvis alium sublimiorem capessendum idonei reddantur, potestque dici imaginaria hæc ordinatio*: that is, "At this day neither is there any place for deacons, nor other inferior clergymen in the church, nor any ministry or function for them to execute: but because it is ordained in the ancient canons, that no man be ordained a presbyter, unless he ascend and climb up by all inferior degrees; therefore for name's sake they are wont to be ordained to every of these degrees in order, and that with a certain solemn rite, that they may be made capable of priestly honour, or any other higher dignity. And this ordination may rightly be termed an imaginary ordination, or in imagination only." And therefore our adversaries cannot justly

¹ "Lectorum vices explent non lectores, sicuti et psalmistarum locum invadunt isti musici non tantum ut de choro ejiciantur dignissimi. . . . Vix ullus reperiatur qui non ad summum sacerdotii culmen, quod nunc est quæstuosius, haud aliter festinet ac si cras aut perendie vetaretur ne quis creetur sacerdos."—Lindan. Panopl. Evang. Lib. iv. cap. 78, 9. [pp. 407, 410.]

² Duaren. De Sacr. Eccles. Ministr. et Benef. Lib. i. cap. 16. [p. 1162, Francof. 1592.]

blame us, who, omitting the other inferior ordinations, give no lower order than that of a deacon.

All these, both ostiaries, lectors, acoluthes, and subdeacons, in former times, were sanctified and set apart to serve God in these meaner employments, that they might be trained up thereby to perform the duties of higher orders. For in those times men were not promoted to the highest rooms but by degrees, being found to have demeaned themselves well in the lower: and therefore they were under a stricter kind of government than they of the laity; and both in their conversation, habit, and all things beseeeming modesty and gravity, they were more precisely tied to the keeping of order than other men. Hereupon they were not suffered to wear their hair long like wantons, uncivil men, or men of war; but were commanded to poll their whole heads, leaving only a circular crown in the lower parts thereof¹.

And here truly we cannot but condemn the absurd custom of the Roman church, violating old canons, degenerating from ancient use, and exposing her priests and Levites to the scorn and contempt of the world by those triobolar shaven crowns which daily she setteth before our eyes. For first, whereas the council of Toledo² in Spain provideth that all clergymen, lectors, deacons, and priests, polling the whole head above, shall leave only a circular crown below, and not as the lectors hitherto had done in the parts of Galicia (who wearing their hair long as laymen, were polled in a little round compass in the tops of their heads only), for that this had been the custom of certain heretics in Spain; the church of Rome abandoneth the form of polling prescribed by the council, and alloweth the observation of those ancient heretics the council condemned. "Here we see," saith bishop Lindan³, "whence these triobolar crowns in the tops of clergymen's heads did come, namely, from certain ancient heretics in

¹ "Clericus nec comam nutriat, nec barbam."—Concil. Carthag. can. XLIV. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1441.]

² Omnes clerici vel lectores sicuti Levitæ et sacerdotes detonso superius capite toto inferius solam circuli coronam relinquant. . . . non sicut huc usque in Galliciae partibus facere lectores videntur, qui prolixis, ut laici, comis in solo capitis apice modicum circulum tondent. Ritus enim iste huc usque in Hispania hæreticorum fuit."—Concil. Toletan. IV. can. XLI. [Tom. VI. col. 1462.]

³ Lindan. Panopl. Evang. Lib. IV. cap. 77. [p. 405.]

Spain. But these lesser things might easily be reformed, if the unspeakable scandals, shames, and dishonours of the church, were first removed and taken away." This is the censure of that learned bishop. Secondly, whereas rasure was not used in ancient times, but condemned by the fathers as most unseemly; they of the church of Rome have left tonsure, and brought in rasure instead thereof. That rasure was not used in ancient times, it appeareth by Clemens Alexandrinus¹, where he saith, that the hairs are to be cut off not with the razor, but with the barber's shears; and by Optatus², bishop of Milevis, where he reprehendeth the Donatists that took certain catholic priests, and by force did shave their heads. "Show us," saith he, "where you are commanded to shave the heads of priests, when as on the contrary side there are so many examples proposed that it ought not so to be done." With Clemens Alexandrinus and Optatus, Hierome³ agreeth, who upon the forty-fourth of Ezekiel saith in express words, that priests must neither nourish their hair, nor be shaved, but so polled, that their skin may still remain hid and covered; and Bellarmine⁴ himself confesseth, that Dionysius, Epiphanius, Hierome, Athanasius, Palladius, Augustine, Isidore, Bede, and the councils of Carthage and Toledo, do speak of tonsure only, and never mention rasure, and that the epistle of Anicetus the pope alleged for rasure is not indubitate. What then will the cardinal bring for defence of the contrary custom now prevailing in the Church of Rome?

¹ "Τὰς μὲν τῆς κεφαλῆς τρίχας, ὥς μὴ αὐξόμεναι ταῖς ὀψεσιν ἐμποδίζοιεν καταβαίνουσαι· καὶ ἴσως τὰς ἐπὶ τῷ μύστακι μολυνομένας κατὰ τὴν τροφήν περικαρτέον· οὐ ξυρῶ, ἀγεννὲς γάρ· ἀλλὰ ταῖς δυοῖν μαχαίραις ταῖς κουρικαῖς."—Clem. Alex. Pædag. [Lib. III. cap. II. p. 290, Oxon. 1715.]

² "Docete ubi vobis mandatum est radere capita sacerdotum, cum e contrario sint tot exempla proposita, fieri non debere."—Optat. contr. Parmenian. Lib. II. [cap. 23, p. 42, Par. 1700.]

³ "Nec calvitium novacula esse faciendum, nec ita ad pressum tendendum caput, ut rasorum similes esse videamur; sed in tantum capillos demittendos, ut operta sit cutis."—Hieron. in Ezech. Lib. XIII. cap. 44. [Tom. V. col. 547, Ven. 1736.]

⁴ "Denique Dionysius, Epiphanius, Hieronymus, Athanasius, Palladius, Augustinus, Isidorus, Beda, et concilia Carthaginense et Toletanum nusquam nominant rasuram, sed solum tonsuram. Unus est Anicetus papa, qui rasuræ meminit, sed non est ea epistola prorsus indubitata, forte enim falsum titulum præfert."—Bellarm. De Monachis, Lib. II. cap. 40. [Tom. II. p. 246.]

And what will he answer to these authorities of the ancient? "We reprehend not," saith he, "the customs of those times, neither do they of those times condemn our observation. For howsoever tonsure, and not rasure, was anciently used, yet were not they of the clergy forbidden to use rasure, or to shave their heads." A strange answer of so great a rabbi, and contrary to that he knoweth to be undoubtedly true. For Optatus directly condemneth rasure, as we have heard; and Hierome¹, writing upon the forty-fourth of Ezekiel, hath these words: *Quod autem sequitur, 'Caput autem suum non radent, neque comam nutrient, sed tondentes attondebunt capita sua,' perspicue demonstratur, nec rasis capitibus, sicut sacerdotes cultoresque Isidis atque Serapis nos esse debere; nec rursum comam dimittere, quod proprie luxuriosorum est barbarorumque et militantium, &c.* That is, "That which followeth, 'They shall not shave their heads, nor let their hair grow long, but polling they shall poll their heads;' doth clearly demonstrate, that we should neither shave our heads, like the priests and worshippers of Isis and Serapis, nor on the other side let our hair grow long, as wantons, barbarous men, and soldiers, are wont to do; that that which is fitting, honest, and seemly, may appear in the faces of the priests." The Septuagint² read the words of the prophet somewhat otherwise, in this sort: "They shall not shave their heads, nor cut their hair too near," *sed operientes operient capita sua*: that is, "but hiding they shall hide their heads:" whereby we learn, that we must neither make ourselves bald by shaving, nor cut the hair of our heads so near as if we were shaven, but let our hair grow so that the skin may be hid and covered. These are the words of Hierome, whereby it appeareth, that the absurd and ridiculous ceremony of the Romanists, in shaving the heads of those of their clergy, is condemned by the fathers, and that Bellarmine speaketh against his own conscience when he saith the contrary. Wherefore, ceasing any longer to insist upon the refutation of the absurdity of so ridiculous a ceremony, and leaving those inferior orders and degrees of ministry in the Church of God, wherein men in ancient times were trained up under the rules of strict

¹ [Tom. v. col. 547.]

² ["Καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν οὐ ξυρήσονται, καὶ τὰς κόμας αὐτῶν οὐ ψιλώσουσι, καλύπτοντες καλύψουσι τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν."—LXX.]

and severe government and discipline, and fitted for higher and greater employments, let us come to the office of the deacons.

The office of bishops and presbyters was from Christ's own immediate institution; but the institution of deacons was from the apostles', as Cyprian¹ delivereth. These the bishop alone may ordain, neither is it necessary that other impose their hands with him, as in the ordination of presbyters, seeing they are consecrated only to be assistants to the bishop and presbyters, and not admitted into the fellowship of the same power and order with them.

The deacons, according to the intendment of their first institution, were to take care of the poor and the treasure of the Church; and thereupon Chrysostom, and after him the fathers of the sixth general council², do think they were not the same we now have; ours being busied in other affairs of the Church. But I am of opinion that they were the same; and that (the end of their first institution being principally to ease the apostles of the care of providing for the poor, and to take the charge of the church-treasure) when the treasure of the Church increasing was committed to certain stewards, and the poor otherwise provided for, they were more specially used for the assisting of the bishop and presbyters in things pertaining to God's service and worship. Whereupon we shall find in some cases they might baptize, reconcile penitents, preach, and do sundry other things pertaining to the office of the bishop and presbyters. That in some cases they might baptize, Tertullian³ witnesseth. That they might reconcile penitents, we have the authority of St Cyprian⁴. That they

¹ "Meminisse autem diaconi debent quoniam apostolos, id est, episcopos et præpositos Dominus elegit. Diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in cœlos apostoli sibi constituerunt episcopatus sui et ecclesiæ ministros."—Cyprian. Lib. III. Epist. 9. [Al. Epist. III. p. 6.]

² "Ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀποστολικῷ ῥητῷ τὸν νοῦν ἐφαρμόσαντες τῶν πατέρων, εὖρομεν ὡς ὁ λόγος αὐτοῖς οὐ περὶ τῶν τοῖς μυστηρίοις διακονουμένων ἦν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς χρεῖαις τῶν τραπεζῶν ὑπουργίας."—Concil. Trull. can. XVI. [Labbe, Tom. VI. col. 1150.]

³ "Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate."—Tertull. De Baptismo. [cap. XVII. p. 230, c.]

⁴ "Si incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non expectata præsentia nostra, apud presbyterum quemcunque præsentem, vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit, et urgere exitus cœperit,

might preach, we have the testimony of St Gregory¹. And that they assisted the bishops and presbyters in ministering the sacrament of the Lord's body and blood, and ministered the cup, it appeareth by Cyprian². And hereupon Hierome amplifieth the dignity of them exceedingly, showing that for avoiding presumption, the presbyters may not take the cup of the Lord from the holy table, unless it be delivered unto them by the deacons. "These are they," saith he³, "of whom we read in the Revelation," *Septem angeli Ecclesiarum, hi sunt septem candelabra aurea, hi sunt voces tonitruorum, virtutum operatione præclari humilitate præditi, quieti, evangelizantes pacem, annunciantes bona, dissensiones et rixas et scandala resecare docentes, soli Deo colloquentes in templo, nihil penitus de mundo cogitantes, dicentes patri et matri, non novi vos, filios suos non agnoscetes. Sine his sacerdos nomen non habet, ortum non habet, officium non habet*: that is, "These are the seven angels of the Churches; these are the seven golden candlesticks; these are the voices of the thunders: these are renowned for the operation of virtues, humble, quiet, preaching peace, publishing good things, teaching how to cut away dissensions brawls and scandals, communing with God alone in his holy temple, having no thought of the world, saying to father and mother, I know you not, and not acknowledging their own sons; without these the priest hath not the name, not the beginning, not the office of a priest." And a little after he addeth, *Sacerdotibus etiam propter præsumptionem non licet de mensa Domini calicem tollere, nisi eis traditus fuerit a diaconis: Levitæ componunt mensam Domini: Levitæ sacerdotibus cum sacramenta benedicunt, assistunt: Levitæ ante sacerdotes orant, ut aures habeamus ad Domi-*

apud diaconum quoque exomologesin facere delicti sui possint."—Cyprian, Lib. III. Epist. XVII. [Al. Epist. XVIII. p. 40, Oxon. 1682.]

¹ "In sancta Romana ecclesia cui divina dispensatio præesse me voluit dudum consuetudo est valde reprehensibilis exorta, ut quidam ad sacri altaris ministerium cantores eligantur, et in diaconatus ordine constituti modulationi vocis inserviant, quos ad prædicationis officium eleemosynarumque studium vacare congruebat."—Greg. Epist. Lib. IV. [Al. Append. Ep. V. Tom. II. col. 1288.]

² "Solennibus adimpletis calicem diaconus offerre præsentibus cœpit."—Cyprian. Serm. De Lapsis. [p. 132.]

³ Hieron. De Sept. Ord. Eccles. [Tom. XI. col. 118.]

num diaconus acclamat: that is, “Even the priests themselves, for the avoiding of presumption, must not take the holy cup from off the table of the Lord, unless it be delivered to them by the deacons. The deacons or Levites prepare the table of the Lord, and make all things ready on the same. The Levites assist the priests when they bless and sanctify the sacramental elements. The Levites pray before the priests. The deacon crieth out aloud unto us to open our ears, and to listen and hear what the Lord will speak unto us.” Great and glorious are these dignities of the deacons; yet the council of Carthage maketh them ministers not of the bishop alone, but of the presbyters also¹; so that they might not sit in the presence of the bishop or presbyters. And when some went about to prefer them before presbyters, Hierome with great violence opposed himself against the same, saying: *Quid patitur mensarum et viduarum minister, ut supra eos se tumidus efferat, ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisque conficitur*²? that is, “What passion is this that thus transporteth the minister of the tables and widows, that swelling in pride he should lift up himself above them, at whose prayers the body and blood of Christ is consecrated.” And objecting to himself the custom of the Roman Church, where a presbyter is ordained upon the testimony of a deacon, he passionately breaketh into these words: *Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem? diaconos paucitas honorabiles, presbyteros turba contemptibiles facit. Cæterum etiam in Ecclesia Romæ presbyteri sedent, et stant diaconi, licet paulatim increbrescentibus vitiis, inter presbyteros, absente episcopo, sedere diaconum viderim*³: that is, “Why dost thou urge me with the custom of one city? The fewness of deacons maketh them honourable, and the number of presbyters make them to be less esteemed. Yet even in the Church of Rome presbyters do sit, and deacons stand; although (things growing worse and worse by degrees, and many things growing out of order) I have seen

¹ “Diaconus ita se presbyteri ut episcopi ministrum noverit.”—Concil. Carthag. iv. can. 37.

“Ut diaconus quolibet loco jubente presbytero sedeat.”—Can. 39. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 140, 1.]

² Hieron. ad Evagrium. [Sive Evangelum. Epist. cXLVI. Tom. i. col. 1075.]

³ [Ibid. col. 1077.]

a deacon in the absence of the bishop sit amongst the presbyters."

Out of the society and company of the deacons in each Church there was one chosen who not only was to perform the things pertaining to the deacon's office, but also to prescribe unto others what they should do. The institution of these is not new, but very ancient, as it appeareth by Hierome¹, who urging the necessity of order and government, sheweth that the herds of cattle have their leaders which they follow; that bees have their king; that the cranes fly after one that leadeth them the way; that there is one emperor, and one judge of each province; that Rome could not have two brethren to reign in her as kings, but was dedicated in parricide; that Esau and Jacob were at war in the womb of Rebekkah; that every Church hath her bishop; every company of presbyters and deacons their archpresbyter and archdeacon.

These chief deacons or archdeacons² were in process of time (notwithstanding all canons to the contrary, and the violent opposition of Hierome and other worthies of those times) lifted up not only above the presbyters, but the archpresbyters also. The reason of which their advancement was, first, because the number of presbyters made them little esteemed, and the paucity and fewness of deacons made them honourable, as I noted before out of Hierome. Secondly, because they were busied about money-matters, and had the charge of the treasure of the Church, which kind of employments are usually much set by. Thirdly, because being ministers unto the bishop, they were used by him for the viewing of such parts of his diocese as he could not conveniently come unto himself, the dispatch of things for him,

¹ "Nulla ars absque magistro discitur. Etiam muta animalia et ferarum greges ductores sequuntur suos. In apibus principes sunt: grues unam sequuntur ordine literato. Imperator unus: judex unus provinciae. Roma ut condita est duos fratres simul habere reges non potuit, et parricidio dedicatur. In Rebekcae utero Esau et Jacob bella gesserunt. Singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, singuli archidiaconi; et omnis ordo ecclesiasticus suis rectoribus nititur." —Hieron. ad Rusticum Monachum. [Epist. cxxv. Tom. i. col. 936.]

² This maketh nothing against them who with us are named archdeacons, and under that name exercise jurisdiction. For by the canons of our Church they are presbyters chosen to assist the bishop in his government, and not mere deacons, as sometimes they were.

and in the end for the reformation of the lesser and smaller faults which upon such view they should find. Whereupon at the last they obtained a kind of jurisdiction and power of correction by prescription and custom, whereof I shall have occasion to speak more hereafter. Thus have we spoken of the inferior degrees of ministry, by which men were wont to ascend to the higher, being trained up for a certain space in the lower, that they might thereby be fitted for the higher, according to that of Hierome touching Nepotian: *Fit clericus, et per solitos gradus presbyter ordinatur*¹; that is, "He is made a clergyman, and passing through the ordinary degrees, he is ordained a presbyter."

CHAPTER XXVI.

OF THE ORDERS AND DEGREES OF THEM THAT ARE TRUSTED WITH THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD AND SACRAMENTS, AND THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD'S PEOPLE; AND PARTICULARLY OF LAY-ELDERS, FALSELY BY SOME SUPPOSED TO BE GOVERNORS OF THE CHURCH.

NOW it remaineth that we speak of them that are trusted with the ministry of the word and sacraments, and the government of God's people, comprehended under one common name of presbyters, that is, fatherly guides of God's church and people. Touching these presbyters, or fatherly guides of God's church, some in our time have a new and strange conceit, making them to be of two sorts: whereof some have charge of government only, and some together therewith the ministry of the word and sacraments; the one sort laymen, and the other clergymen; the one sort governing only, and the other sort preaching, teaching, ministering sacraments, and governing also.

Touching these newly-supposed governing elders, that are not ministers of the word and sacraments, I will first set down the reasons that move us to think there never were any such in the church; and secondly, I will show the weakness of their reasons that are induced to think there were.

¹ Hieron. in Epitaph. Nepotiani ad Heliodorum. [Epist. LX. Tom. I. col. 335.]

The first reason that moveth us to think there never were any such, is, because bishops, presbyters that preach and minister sacraments, and deacons that assist them, howsoever they much degenerated in later times, yet all still remained in all Christian Churches throughout the world (though in many things exceedingly different, as Greek, Latin, Æthiopian and Armenian) in their names and offices also in some sort. But of these lay-elders there are no footsteps to be found in any Christian Church in the world, nor were not for many hundred years; whereas there would have been some remains of these as well as of the other, had they ever had any institution from Christ and his apostles, as the other had.

Our second reason is, for that St Paul¹ prescribing Timothy how he should establish the Church and appoint her pastors, and showing who should be bishops and ministers, who deacons, yea who widows, passeth immediately from describing the quality of such as were to be bishops and ministers of the word and sacraments to the deacons, omitting these lay-elders that are supposed to lie in the midst between them, no way describing unto us of what quality they must be, which in reason he neither might nor would have omitted if there had been any such.

Our third reason is, for that neither Scripture, nor practice of the Church, bounding the government of such governors, nor giving any direction how far they may go in the same, and where they must stay, lest they meddle with that they have nothing to do with, men should be left to a most dangerous uncertainty in an office and employment of so great consequence, either of not doing that their office and place requireth, or presuming beyond that they should; which is not to be conceived, seeing Christ our gracious Saviour, by himself or his apostles, left certain direction for far lesser things than these men's government is supposed to be. That the government of these supposed lay-elders is not bounded in the Scripture or fathers, it is most evident, neither can any man living show us any such bounding of the same in either of them. The government of the Church is in respect of two sorts of men, the clergy and the laity. Touching the former, they are to be tried and approved for their life and learning; they are to be ordained with solemn imposition of

¹ 1 Tim. iii.

hands ; and if they deserve it, they are to be suspended from the execution of their office, or utterly deprived, and degraded. Shall lay-elders have as much to do in all these actions as they to whom the ministry of the word and sacraments is committed ? Are they competent judges of men's learning and aptness to teach, that neither are teachers nor learned ? Can they give the sacred power of holy ministry to others, that have it not themselves ? Or is it not a certain axiom on the contrary side, that the lesser is blessed of the greater ? Surely they that in England sought to bring in the government of the Church by lay-elders, were of opinion that they ought to have interest in all these things, as well as the pastors of the Church : and indeed admit them to the government of the Church by force of certain doubtful words of Scripture, mentioning government without any distinction or limitation ; and there is no reason to straighten them but that they should have their sway in all parts of it. But they of Geneva, France, and other parts, exclude these elders from intermeddling in ordination, and leave the power to try, examine, approve, and ordain, to the pastors only¹. Likewise, as I think, they refer the deciding of doubts in matters of faith and religion to the pastors only, and not to the suffrages of laymen by multitude of voices overruling them. Touching the other sort of them of whom the Church consisteth, which are laymen, who are to be admonished, corrected, put from the sacraments, yea, from the communion of the Church for impiety, disobedience, and wickedness, and upon repentance and submission to be received again ; doth not the ordering of these men in this sort come within the compass of the power of the keys, and of binding and loosing ? Did Christ leave these to his apostles as special favours, and are they now transferred from their successors, the bishops and pastors of the Church, to laymen that have neither part nor fellowship in the work of the ministry ? Hath God committed the dispensation of his sacraments to the pastors of the Church ? Is it on the peril of their souls, that they duly give them, or withhold them, as cause shall require ? And shall there be in others, that are not trusted with them, as great a power to direct the use of this ministerial authority as in them ? Nay, greater, the other being more in number, and their voices

¹ See Beza's Epistles, and Calvin's Institut. Lib. iv. cap. 3. § 16.

more to carry anything that shall be brought into deliberation? Besides all this which hath been said, there are many more doubts touching the authority of these men, wherein I fear there will be none found amongst the friends and favourers of these lay-elders that will be able to give us any satisfaction. For first, I would gladly know, whether these ruling elders must be in every congregation with power of ordination, and deprivation, suspension, excommunication, and absolution? Or whether this power be only in the ministers and elders of diverse churches concurring? Surely in Geneva there are elders in the congregations that are abroad *in agro*, that is, in the country: but these have no power of excommunication, much less of ordination or deprivation; they may only complain to the consistory of the city: nay, they that are in the congregations within the city have no separate power with their own ministers, but a joint proceeding with the rest of the ministers and elders of the other churches and congregations; all which concurring make but one consistory. Secondly, let them tell us whether these offices be perpetual, as the offices of bishops and pastors, or annual and but for a certain time.

But to leave them in these uncertainties, the fourth reason that moveth us to reject the conceit of these lay-elders, is, because the founders of this new government fetch the pattern of it from the Sanhedrim of the Jews, the platform whereof they suppose Christ meant to bring into his Church when he said, "Tell the Church¹." Whereas it is most clear, that that court was as a civil court, and had power to banish, to imprison, yea, and to take away life, till by the Romans the Jews were restrained: which made them say in the case of Christ, that "it was not lawful for them to put any man to death²."

Our fifth and last reason is, for that all fathers and councils mentioning elders or presbyters, place them between bishops and deacons, and make them to be clergymen; and that in the Acts, where the apostles are said to have constituted elders in every Church, pastors and ministers are meant, and not laymen, is strongly confirmed by that in the twentieth of Acts, where the elders of the Church of Ephesus convened before Paul are commanded to "feed the flock of

¹ Matt. xviii. 17.

² John xviii. 31.

Christ, over which they were appointed overseers;" whence it followeth inevitably that they were pastors.

The places of Scripture brought to prove this kind of government by lay-elders are specially three. The first is that to Timothy, "Let the elders that rule well be esteemed worthy of double honour, especially they that labour in the word and doctrine¹." The second is that in the epistle to the Romans: "He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence²." The third is that to the Corinthians, where "governors³," or "governments," are mentioned. The two later allegations are too weak to prove the thing in question. For will any man that knoweth what it is to reason, reason *a genere ad speciem affirmative*, that is, "from the general to the particular and special affirmatively?" Or will ever any man of common sense be persuaded that this consequence is good: "there were governors in the primitive Church mentioned by the apostles, and required by them to rule with diligence; therefore they were lay-governors?" Surely I think not. Wherefore let us see if the first place alleged by them yield any better proof. Touching this place, some interpret it in this sort: The guides of the Church are worthy of double honour, both in respect of governing and teaching, but specially for their pains in teaching; so noting two parts or duties of presbyterial offices, not two sorts of presbyters. Some in this sort: Amongst the elders and guides of God's Church and people, some laboured principally in governing and ministering the sacraments, some in preaching, and teaching: so Paul sheweth, that he preached and laboured more than all the apostles⁴, but baptized few or none⁵, leaving that to be performed by others; and when Paul and Barnabas were companions, and their travels were equal, yet Paul is noted to have been the chief speaker⁶: so that though both were worthy of double honour, yet Paul especially. Some interpret the words in this sort: "There were some that remained in some certain places, for the guiding and governing of such as were already won by the preaching of the gospel; other that travailed with great labour and pains from place to place, to spread the knowledge of

¹ 1 Tim. v. 17.

² Rom. xii. 8.

³ 1 Cor. xii. 28.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 10.

⁵ 1 Cor. i. 14.

⁶ Acts xiv. 12.

God into all parts, and to preach Christ crucified to such as had never heard of him before. Both these were worthy of double honour, but the latter that builded not upon another man's foundation, more especially than the former, that did but keep that which others had gotten, and governed those that others had gained." Thus we see that these words may have a very good and true sense, without pressing of them to confirm the late conceit of some few men touching lay-elders: which construction we have no reason to admit, seeing the circumstances of the place do not enforce it, nor no ecclesiastical writer did ever so interpret the words before our age. So that, to conclude this point, the name of presbyter, (one place only in the first of Timothy and the fifth excepted, where it is a name of age and not of office,) in the writings of the apostles doth ever note out unto us a minister of the word and sacraments. The reason why the apostles chose this word rather than the name of *sacerdos*, which we commonly translate priest (though the English word priest come of presbyter,) was, lest there should be a confusion of the ministers of the Old Testament, who were to offer sacrifices unto God, figuring the coming of Christ, with those of the New; and to show that none should be appointed ministers but men of ripe age and confirmed judgment. But some man will say, the ancient writers mention seniors, without whose advice nothing was done; an ecclesiastical senate and a presbytery, or company of presbyters, which governed the Church together with the bishop: therefore the matter is not so clear against lay-elders as some would make it.

We deny not but that there were presbyters in the primitive Church constituted and ordained by the apostles and their successors, not only to preach and minister sacraments, but to govern, direct, and guide the people of God also; but that they were laymen it cannot be proved. The bishops in the greater Churches, and in the cities, had a great number of clergymen serving in divers sorts, as it appeareth by Cyprian, and the whole ecclesiastical history; but out of the whole clergy at large, the presbytery or company of presbyters was called forth to the weightiest deliberations, and to assist the bishop for the preservation of discipline. *Admonitos nos et instructos sciatis dignatione divina*, saith Cyprian¹, *ut Nu-*

¹ Cyprian, Lib. iv. Epist. x. [Al. Epist. xl. p. 78.]

midicus presbyter ascribatur presbyterorum Carthagen-sium numero, et nobiscum sedeat in clero: that is, “Know ye that we have been admonished and directed by God himself to choose Numidicus, and to make him one of the company of the presbyters of Carthage, that he may sit together with us as a clergyman:” by which words it appeareth, that there was in Cyprian’s time a college of presbyters or elders in the Church of Carthage, which sat together with the bishop for the hearing and determining of the causes of the Church; but that these elders were clergymen, and not such lay-seniors as some would have. Cornelius¹ bishop of Rome, writing to Cyprian, *se totum presbyterium contraxisse*, that is, that he drew together the whole presbytery, for the reconciling of certain schismatics to the Church, and that he called together five bishops also, and by common consent ended the whole matter. Of this senate and company of presbyters, Tertullian speaketh in his Apology, when he saith: “With us the most approved seniors do sit as presidents, to censure offenders, and to exercise discipline².” And of these likewise is it that Hierome saith, writing upon Esay: “We also in the Church have our senate, the company of presbyters³.” And upon Titus: “The Churches were governed by the common advice and counsel of the presbyters⁴.” For to put it out of doubt that he meaneth not lay-elders, he saith in the same place: *Idem est ergo presbyter qui episcopus*: that is, “Therefore a presbyter and bishop are all one.”

There is only one place in Ambrose that hath some show of proof for lay-elders. His words are: “The Jewish synagogue, and after the Church, had seniors or elders, without whose counsel nothing was done in the Church; which by what negligence it grew out I know not, unless it were by the sloth or pride of the teachers, whilst they alone would seem to

¹ Apud Cyprian. Lib. III. Epist. xi. [Al. Epist. xlix. p. 92.]

² “Præsident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti, neque enim pretio ulla res Dei constat.”—Tertull. Apolog. cap. xxxix. [p. 51.]

³ “Et nos habemus in ecclesia senatum nostrum, cœtum presbyterorum.”—Hieron. in Isaiam, cap. iii. [Tom. IV. col. 51.]

⁴ “Idem est ergo presbyter qui et episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis: ‘Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephæ,’ communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur.”—Id. in Tit. i. [Tom. VII. col. 694.]

be something¹." Here is mention of elders without whose advice nothing was done; but it is not said they were laymen. But some man perhaps will reply, that the elders which Ambrose speaketh of ceased before his time, which cannot be understood of clergymen; therefore they were laymen. To this we say, that Ambrose doth not say, the elders without whose counsel nothing was to be done, ceased before his time, and were no more, but that the advising and consulting with them ceased, whilst some would do all themselves. If it be said, that they who thus assumed more than was fit, and excluded those seniors without whose counsel anciently nothing was done, are not said to have been bishops, but doctors, and that therefore Ambrose speaketh, not of bishops excluding other ministers of the word and sacraments from their consultations, but of clergymen refusing the advice of lay-seniors; we answer, that Ambrose by the name of teachers, whose sloth or pride he condemneth in this place, might fitly understand the bishops, seeing none but bishops have power to preach in their own right, and other but only by permission from them. Hereupon it is that Possidonius in the Life of Augustine² saith, that Valerius bishop of Hippo gave St Augustine his presbyter leave to preach, because being a Grecian, he could not very well express himself in Latin. In the council of Vase³ leave is given by the council of bishops

¹ "Apud omnes utique gentes honorabilis est senectus; unde et synagoga, et postea ecclesia seniores habuit, quorum sine consilio nihil agebatur in ecclesia. Quod qua negligentia obsolevit, nescio; nisi forte doctorum desidia, aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri."—Pseudo-Ambros. in 1 Tim. v. [Tom. II. Append. col. 298.]

² "Sanctus Valerius ordinator ejus, ut erat vir pius et Deum timens, exultabat et Deo gratias agebat suas exauditas a Domino fuisse preces quas se frequentissime fudisse narrabat, ut sibi divinitus homo concederetur talis qui posset verbo Dei et doctrina salubri ecclesiam Domini ædificare: cui rei se homo natura Græcus minusque Latina lingua et litteris instructus minus utilem pervidebat. Et eidem presbytero potestatem dedit coram se in ecclesia evangelium prædicandi ac frequentissime tractandi; contra usum quidem et consuetudinem Africanarum ecclesiarum."—Possid. in Vit. August. cap. 5. [Inter Opp. August. Tom. x. Append. col. 260.]

³ "Hoc etiam pro ædificatione omnium ecclesiarum, et pro utilitate totius populi nobis placuit, ut non solum in civitatibus, sed etiam in omnibus parochiis verbum faciendi daremus presbyteris potestatem."—Concil. Vasens. can. II. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 822.]

to presbyters for to preach. But because this question touching lay-elders is excellently handled by sundry of our divines, I will not trouble the reader with any farther discourse of this matter.

CHAPTER XXVII.

OF THE DISTINCTION OF THE POWER OF ORDER AND JURISDICTION, AND THE PRE-EMINENCE OF ONE AMONGST THE PRESBYTERS OF EACH CHURCH, WHO IS NAMED A BISHOP.

CEASING to speak of supposed lay-elders, which the Church of God knoweth not, let us come to the other that were appointed to teach and govern the people of God. Where, first, we are to speak of the diverse degrees of honour and pre-eminence found amongst them. Secondly, of their calling and appointing to the same. And thirdly, of their maintenance. For the clearing of the former of these things, the schoolmen note that there is a twofold power found in the ministers of the Church of God, the one of order, the other of jurisdiction. The power of order is that whereby they are sanctified and enabled to the performance of such sacred acts as other men neither may nor can do; as is the preaching of the word, and ministration of the holy sacraments. This power is to be exercised orderly, and the acts of it to be performed in such sort that one disturb not another. Whereupon the apostles, the first ministers of Christ Jesus, though equal in the power of order and jurisdiction, yet for the better and more orderly despatch of the great work of converting the world, which they had in hand, and that they might not hinder one another, divided amongst themselves the parts and provinces of the world; but when for the assisting of them while they lived, and succeeding them dying, they were to pass over part of their power to other, they so gave authority to such as they made choice of for this work, to preach, baptize, and do other acts of sacred ministry (which are to be performed by virtue of the power of order), that before they invested them with this power, they divided the parts of the world converted to Christianity into several Churches, and when they ordained them, assigned each of them to that par-

particular Church wherein he should preach and minister sacraments. So that these successors of the apostles had not an illimited commission, but were confined within certain bounds; that they were not to preach, nor minister sacraments, but only within the limits and compass of those places which were assigned unto them, unless it were with the consent, desire, and liking of other, willing to draw them at sometimes, for special causes, to perform such sacred acts within the limits and bounds of their charge.

This assigning of men having the power of order, the persons to whom they were to minister holy things, and of whom they were to take the care, and the subjecting of such persons unto them, gave them the power of jurisdiction which they had not before. And thus was the use of the power of order, which is not included within any certain bounds, limited in those the apostles ordained, and their power of jurisdiction included within certain bounds; so that the one of these kinds of power they have not at all without the extent of their own limits, nor the lawful use of the other. Hence is that resolution of the divines, that if a bishop adventure to do any act of jurisdiction out of his own diocese, as to excommunicate, absolve, or the like, all such acts are utterly void, and of no force; but if he shall do any act of the power of order in another man's charge, as preach, or minister sacraments, though he cannot be excused as not offending, if he do these things without his consent, yet are the sacraments thus ministered truly sacraments, and of force.

When the apostles first founded Churches, and assigned to such as they ordained to the work of the ministry the several parts of the flock of Christ, and people of God, of which they appointed them to take care and charge, they so sorted and divided out particular Churches, that a city and the places near adjoining made but one Church: whereupon we shall find in the holy Scriptures, that to ordain presbyters, *κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*¹, and *κατὰ πόλιν*², that is, in every Church, and in every city, are all one. Now because Churches of so large extent required many ministers of the word and sacraments, and yet of one Church there must be but one pastor; the apostles, in settling the state of these Churches, did so constitute in them many presbyters with power to teach, instruct,

¹ Acts xiv. 23.

² Titus i. 5.

and direct the people of God, that yet they appointed one only to be chief pastor of the place, ordaining that the rest should be but his assistants, not presuming to do anything without him; so that though they were all equal in the power of order, yet were the rest inferior unto him in the government of that Church whereof he was pastor, and they but his assistants only: as another of my rank cannot have that jurisdiction within my Church as I have, but if he will have anything to do there, he must be inferior in degree unto me. So we read in the Revelation of St. John, of the Angel of the Church of Ephesus¹, to whom the Spirit of God directeth letters from heaven, as to the pastor of that Church. It is not to be doubted but that there were many presbyters, that is, ministers of the word and sacraments, in so large a Church as that of Ephesus was; nay, we read expressly in the Acts, that there were many in that Church that fed the flock of Christ², and consequently were admitted into some part of pastoral office and employment; yet was there one amongst the rest to whom only the Lord did write from heaven, to whom an eminent power was given, who was trusted with the government of that Church and people in more special sort than any of the rest, and therefore challenged by name by Almighty God for the things there found to be amiss, the rest being passed over in silence. The like we read of the rest of the seven Churches of Asia³, compared to seven golden candlesticks, in the midst whereof the Son of God did walk, having in his hand seven stars, interpreted to have been the seven angels of those seven Churches. Neither was this orderly superiority of one amongst the presbyters of the Church found only in the seven Churches of Asia, but in other Churches also. For Saint Hierome testifieth⁴, that in the Church of Alexandria, from the time of Mark the Evangelist, there was ever one whom the presbyters of that Church chose out of themselves to be over the rest. Neither was this proper to the Church of Alexandria, but we can show the successions of bishops in all the famous Churches of the world, even from the

¹ Rev. ii. 1.² Acts xx. 28.³ Rev. i. 20.

⁴ "Alexandriæ a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclum et Dionysium episcopos presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant."—Hieron. ad Evagrium. [sive Evangel. Epist. cxlvi. Tom. i. col. 1076.]

ticular Church wherein he should preach and minister sacraments. So that these successors of the apostles had not an illimited commission, but were confined within certain bounds; that they were not to preach, nor minister sacraments, but only within the limits and compass of those places which were assigned unto them, unless it were with the consent, desire, and liking of other, willing to draw them at sometimes, for special causes, to perform such sacred acts within the limits and bounds of their charge.

This assigning of men having the power of order, the persons to whom they were to minister holy things, and of whom they were to take the care, and the subjecting of such persons unto them, gave them the power of jurisdiction which they had not before. And thus was the use of the power of order, which is not included within any certain bounds, limited in those the apostles ordained, and their power of jurisdiction included within certain bounds; so that the one of these kinds of power they have not at all without the extent of their own limits, nor the lawful use of the other. Hence is that resolution of the divines, that if a bishop adventure to do any act of jurisdiction out of his own diocese, as to excommunicate, absolve, or the like, all such acts are utterly void, and of no force; but if he shall do any act of the power of order in another man's charge, as preach, or minister sacraments, though he cannot be excused as not offending, if he do these things without his consent, yet are the sacraments thus ministered truly sacraments, and of force.

When the apostles first founded Churches, and assigned to such as they ordained to the work of the ministry the several parts of the flock of Christ, and people of God, of which they appointed them to take care and charge, they so sorted and divided out particular Churches, that a city and the places near adjoining made but one Church: whereupon we shall find in the holy Scriptures, that to ordain presbyters, *κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*¹, and *κατὰ πόλιν*², that is, in every Church, and in every city, are all one. Now because Churches of so large extent required many ministers of the word and sacraments, and yet of one Church there must be but one pastor; the apostles, in settling the state of these Churches, did so constitute in them many presbyters with power to teach, instruct,

¹ Acts xiv. 23.

² Titus i. 5.

and direct the people of God, that yet they appointed one only to be chief pastor of the place, ordaining that the rest should be but his assistants, not presuming to do anything without him; so that though they were all equal in the power of order, yet were the rest inferior unto him in the government of that Church whereof he was pastor, and they but his assistants only: as another of my rank cannot have that jurisdiction within my Church as I have, but if he will have anything to do there, he must be inferior in degree unto me. So we read in the Revelation of St. John, of the Angel of the Church of Ephesus¹, to whom the Spirit of God directeth letters from heaven, as to the pastor of that Church. It is not to be doubted but that there were many presbyters, that is, ministers of the word and sacraments, in so large a Church as that of Ephesus was; nay, we read expressly in the Acts, that there were many in that Church that fed the flock of Christ², and consequently were admitted into some part of pastoral office and employment; yet was there one amongst the rest to whom only the Lord did write from heaven, to whom an eminent power was given, who was trusted with the government of that Church and people in more special sort than any of the rest, and therefore challenged by name by Almighty God for the things there found to be amiss, the rest being passed over in silence. The like we read of the rest of the seven Churches of Asia³, compared to seven golden candlesticks, in the midst whereof the Son of God did walk, having in his hand seven stars, interpreted to have been the seven angels of those seven Churches. Neither was this orderly superiority of one amongst the presbyters of the Church found only in the seven Churches of Asia, but in other Churches also. For Saint Hierome testifieth⁴, that in the Church of Alexandria, from the time of Mark the Evangelist, there was ever one whom the presbyters of that Church chose out of themselves to be over the rest. Neither was this proper to the Church of Alexandria, but we can show the successions of bishops in all the famous Churches of the world, even from the

¹ Rev. ii. 1.² Acts xx. 28.³ Rev. i. 20.

⁴ "Alexandriæ a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclum et Dionysium episcopos presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant."—Hieron. ad Evagrium. [sive Evangel. Epist. cxlvi. Tom. i. col. 1076.]

apostles' times ; and therefore all admit and allow a kind of pre-eminence of one above the rest in each Church. " Heresies have sprung," saith Cyprian, " and schisms risen, from no other fountain than this, that God's priest is not obeyed, nor one priest in the Church acknowledged for the time to be judge in Christ's stead¹." " If one," saith Hierome, " in each Church be not above and before the rest of the presbyters, there will be as many schisms as priests²;" and the best learned in our age³ that affect presbyterial government, ingenuously confess it to be an essential and perpetual part of God's ordinance, for each presbytery to have a chief amongst them ; the necessity whereof we may learn from all societies, both of men endued with reason, and of other things also, to which God hath denied the light of understanding. " The dumb beasts," saith Hierome, " and wild herds, have their leaders which they follow ; the bees have their king ; the cranes fly after one in order, like an alphabet of letters ; there is but one emperor, one judge of a province ; Rome newly built could not endure two brethren to be kings together, and therefore was dedicated in parricide ; Esau and Jacob were at war in the womb of Rebecca ; every Church hath her own bishop, her own arch-presbyter, her own chief deacon ; and all ecclesiastical order consisteth herein, that some do rule and direct the rest. In a ship there is but one that directeth the helm. In a house or family there is but one master. And to conclude, in an army, if it be never so great, yet the direction of one general is expected⁴."

¹ " Neque enim aliunde hæreses abortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod] sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus iudex vice Christi cogitatur." —Cyprian. Lib. i. Epist. iii. [Al. Epist. lix. p. 129.]

² " Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors quædam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata quot sacerdotes." —Hieron. adversus Luciferianos. [Tom. ii. col. 182.]

³ " Tu vis denique ecclesiasticam censuram episcopis et re ac nomine presbyteris cum ea auctoritate tribui quam Deus apostolis et ecclesiæ futuris episcopis dedit. Et nos vero quid aliud postulamus?" —Beza, in Respons. ad Tract. de Ministr. Evang. Gradibus. [p. 3, Gen. 1592.]

⁴ " Nulla ars absque magistro discitur. Etiam muta animalia et ferarum greges ductores sequuntur suos. In apibus principes sunt:

Thus then all confess, that there always hath been, and must be in each Church, a pre-eminence of one above the rest of the presbyters of the same; but some think this pre-eminence should be only a priority of order, in sitting before, in propounding things to be thought of, and in moderating the whole action of deliberation, and that all things should be swayed by voices; the president or bishop having no voice, negative or affirmative, but as the major part shall direct him. Likewise this presidency they think should be but annual, or to end with the action about which they meet, whether it be to determine a doubt, to ordain a minister, or to do any other such like thing.

This new conceit we cannot approve of, because we find no pattern of any such bishop or president in all antiquity. But the fathers describe unto us such a bishop as hath eminent and peerless power, without whose consent the presbyters can do nothing. "Hence have heresies sprung and schisms arisen," saith Cyprian, "because one priest in the Church is not acknowledged for the time to be judge in Christ's stead, to whom if all the brethren would be subject, according to the divine directions, no man would, after the divine judgments, after the suffrages of the people, after the consent of other bishops, make himself judge, not of the bishop, but of God¹." "Let the presbyter," saith Ignatius²,

grues unam sequuntur ordine literato. Imperator unus: judex unus provinciæ. Roma ut condita est, duos fratres simul habere reges non potuit, et parricidio dedicatur. In Rebeccæ utero Esau et Jacob bella gesserunt. Singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, singuli archidiaconi; et omnis ordo ecclesiasticus suis rectoribus nititur. In navi unus gubernator; in domo unus Dominus; in quamvis grandi exercitu unius signum expectatur.—Hieron. ad Rusticum Monachum. [Epist. cxxv. Tom. I. col. 936.]

¹ "Neque aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur. Cui si secundum magisteria divina obtemperaret fraternitas universa, nemo adversum sacerdotum collegium quidquam moveret; nemo post divinum judicium, post populi suffragium, post co-episcoporum consensum, judicem se jam non episcopi sed Dei faceret."—Cyprian, Lib. I. Epist. iii. [Al. Epist. lix. p. 129.]

² "Ὡςπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐδὲν ποιεῖ, . . . οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ πρεσβύτερος, μηδὲ διάκονος, μηδὲ λαϊκός."—Ignat.

“do nothing without the bishop.” “The bishop,” saith Hierome, “must have an eminent and peerless power, or else there will be as many schisms in the Church as there are priests¹.” And Tertullian showeth, that without the bishop’s leave and consent no presbyter may baptize, minister any sacrament, or do any ministerial act². So that it is most clear and evident, that the bishop in each Church is above and before the rest of the presbyters of the same, not in order only, but in degree also and power of jurisdiction.

Yet on the other side, we make not the power of bishops to be princely, as Bellarmine doth, but fatherly: so that as the presbyters may do nothing without the bishop, so he may do nothing in matters of greatest moment and consequence without their presence and advice. Whereupon the council of Carthage³ voideth all sentences of bishops which the presence of their clergy confirmeth not; and even unto this day they have no power to alienate lands, and to do some such like things, without the concurrence and consent of the presbyters of the cathedral and great Church.

It is therefore most false that Bellarmine⁴ hath, that presbyters have no power of jurisdiction, and the proof he bringeth of this his assertion most weak, when he allegeth,

ad Magnes. [cap. 7. Tom. II. p. 55, Coteler. Patr. Apost. Amstel. 1724.]

¹ “Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet; cui si non exsors quædam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata quot sacerdotes.”—Hieron. adversus Luciferianos. [Tom. II. col. 182.]

² “Dandi quidem jus habet summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est.”—Tertull. De Baptismo. [cap. XXVII. p. 230, Par. 1675.]

³ “Ut episcopus nullius causam audiat absque præsentia clericorum suorum: alioquin irrita erit sententia episcopi, nisi clericorum præsentia confirmetur.”—Concil. Carthag. IV. can. 23. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1439.]

⁴ “Quod episcoporum auctoritas non sit in cœtu presbyterorum quasi consulis in senatu, sed ut principis in concilio consiliariorum sibi subjectorum, primum colligitur ex testimoniis B. Pauli, in epistola ad Timotheum, Clementis, Irenæi, Tertulliani, deinde ex conciliis. Omnia siquidem concilia, tum generalia, tum provincialia, etiam antiquissima, quorum meminit Eusebius, a solis episcopis celebrata sunt.”—Bellarm. De Clericis, Lib. I. cap. 14. [Tom. II. p. 133.]

that all councils, both general and provincial, wherein jurisdiction is most properly exercised, were celebrated and holden by bishops, as if presbyters had had nothing to do therein. For it is most clear and evident, that in all provincial synods presbyters did sit, give voice, and subscribe, as well as bishops. And howsoever in general councils none did give voice but bishops alone, yet those bishops that were present, bringing the resolution and consent of the provincial synods of those Churches from whence they came, in which synods presbyters had their voices, they had a kind of consent to the decrees of general councils also; and nothing was passed in them without their concurrence. Thus were things moderated in the primitive ages of the Church; and though bishops had power over presbyters, yet was it so limited, that there was nothing bitter or grievous in it, nothing but that which was full of sweetness and content. For if any difference grew between the bishop and his presbyters, the presbyters might not judge their bishop, whom they were to acknowledge to be a judge in Christ's stead; but an appeal lay unto a provincial synod, to which not only the bishops of the provinces were to come, but a certain number of presbyters also out of each Church, to sit as judges of such differences. Neither might the bishop of himself alone deprive, degrade, or put from their office and dignity the presbyters and deacons of his Church; but if there were any matter concerning a presbyter, he was to join unto him five other bishops of the province, and if any matter concerning a deacon, two other bishops, before he might proceed to give sentence against presbyter or deacon¹. The causes of other inferior clergymen the bishop might hear and determine himself alone, without the concurrence and presence of other bishops, but not without the concurrence of his own clergy, without whose presence no sentence of the bishop was of force, but judged and pronounced void by the canon.

Touching the pre-eminence of bishops above presbyters, there is some difference among the school-divines: for the best learned amongst them are of opinion, that bishops are

¹ "Si autem presbyteri vel diaconi fuerint accusati, adjuncto sibi ex vicinis locis legitimo numero collegarum, id est, in presbyteri nomine quinque, in diaconi duobus, episcopi ipsorum causas discutiant."—*Concil. Carthag. iii. can. 8.* [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 1401.]

not greater than presbyters in the power of consecration or order, but only in the exercise of it, and in the power of jurisdiction, seeing presbyters may preach, and minister the greatest of all sacraments, by virtue of their consecration and order, as well as bishops. "Touching the power of consecration or order," saith Durandus¹, "it is much doubted of among divines, whether any be greater therein than an ordinary presbyter: for Hierome seemeth to have been of opinion, that the highest power of consecration or order is the power of a priest or elder; so that every priest, in respect of his priestly power, may minister all sacraments, confirm the baptized, give all orders, all blessings and consecrations; but that for the avoiding of the peril of schism, it was ordained that one should be chosen, who should be named a bishop, to whom the rest should obey, and to whom it was reserved to give orders, and to do some such other things as none but bishops do." And afterwards he saith, that Hierome is clearly of this opinion; not making the distinction of bishops from presbyters a mere human invention, or a thing not necessary, as Aerius did; but thinking that amongst them who are equal in the power of order, and equally enabled to do any sacred act, the apostles (for the avoiding of schism and confusion, and the preservation of unity, peace, and order) ordained that in each Church one should be before and above the rest, without whom the rest should do nothing, and to whom some things should be peculiarly reserved, as the dedicating of Churches, reconciling of penitents, confirming of the baptized, and the ordination of such as are to serve in the work of the ministry: of which the three former were reserved to the bishop alone, *Potius ad honorem sacerdotii, quam ad legis*

¹ "De potestate consecrationis vel ordinis est magnum dubium. Hieronymus enim videtur consensisse quod summa potestas consecrationis suæ ordinis erat potestas sacerdotalis ita quod omnis sacerdos quantum est de potestate sacerdotali potest omnia sacramenta ministrare, confirmationem, omnes ordines, omnes benedictiones, et omnes consecrationes facere, sed propter periculum schismatis fuit ordinatum, ut sacerdotes unum ex seipsis eligerent qui diceretur episcopus, quasi super alios intendens, cui alii obedirent, et cui reservatum est ordines facere, et hujusmodi quæ non faciunt nisi soli episcopi. Episcopus ergo major est sacerdote quantum ad potestatem jurisdictionis, sed non quo ad potestatem ordinis vel consecrationis."—Durandus a Sancto-Portiano, in 4 Sent. Dist. xxiv. [Quæst. 5, fol. 313, A. Par. 1550.]

necessitatem; that is, “rather to honour his priestly and bishoply place, than for that these things at all may not be done by any other.” And therefore we read, that at sometimes, and in some cases of necessity, presbyters¹ did reconcile penitents, and by imposition of hands confirm the baptized. But the ordaining of men to serve in the work of the ministry, is more properly reserved to them. For seeing none are to be ordained at random, but to serve in some Church, and none have Churches but bishops, all other being but assistants to them in their Churches; none may ordain but they only, unless it be in cases of extreme necessity, as when all bishops are extinguished by death, or, fallen into heresy, obstinately refuse to ordain men to preach the gospel of Christ sincerely. And then as the care and charge of the Church is devolved to the presbyters remaining catholic, so likewise the ordaining of men to assist them, and succeed them in the work of the ministry. But hereof I have spoken at large elsewhere. Wherefore to conclude this point, we see that the best learned amongst the schoolmen are of opinion, that bishops are no greater than presbyters in the power of consecration or order, but only in the exercise of it, and in the power of jurisdiction; with whom Stapleton² seemeth to agree, saying expressly, that *Quoad ordinem sacerdotalem, et ea quæ sunt ordinis*; that is, “In respect of sacerdotal order, and the things that pertain to order,” they are equal, and that therefore in all administration of sacraments which depend of order, they are all equal *potestate*, though not *exercitio*; that is, in power, though not in the execution of things to be done by virtue of that power: whence it will follow, that ordination being a kind of sacrament, and so depending of the power of order, in the judgment of our adversaries might be ministered by presbyters; but that for the avoiding of such horrible confusions, scandals, and schisms, as would follow upon such promiscuous ordinations, they are restrained by the decree of the

¹ “Apud Ægyptum presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit episcopus.” [Pseudo] Ambros. in Ephes. iv. [Tom. II. Append. col. 241. f.]

² “Quoad ordinem sacerdotalem et ad ea quæ sunt ordinis ut maxime ad conficiendum corpus, et sanguinem Christi nullum est in his omnibus discrimen. Itaque in omni administratione sacramentorum quæ pendent ab ordine, omnes pares sunt; potestate autem non exercitio.” —Stapleton, Relect. Controv. II. Quæst. 3. Art. 3. [Tom. I. p. 615.]

apostles; and none permitted to do any such thing, except it be in case of extreme necessity, but bishops, who have the power of order in common together with presbyters, but yet so as that they excel them in the execution of things to be done by virtue of that power, and in the power of jurisdiction also.

But Bellarmine¹ saith, the catholic Church acknowledgeth and teacheth, that the degree of bishops is greater than that of presbyters by God's law, as well in the power of order as jurisdiction: and addeth, that the school-men upon the fourth of the sentences defend the same, and Thomas in his *Summa*; which yet elsewhere² he confesseth to be untrue. This his opinion he endeavoureth to confirm, because none but bishops do ordain; and if they do, their ordinations are judged void: which they could not be by the Church's prohibition, or decree of the apostles, if they were equal in the power of order to bishops. Hereunto I have answered elsewhere³, showing that ordinations at large, or *sine titulo*, and ordinations in another man's charge by bishops, who by the character of their order may ordain, are likewise pronounced to be void by the ancient canons: and that therefore the prohibition of the Church and decree of the apostles for the avoiding of confusion and schism, reserving the honour of ordaining to bishops only (unless it were in the case of extreme necessity), might make the ordinations of all other to be void, though equal with them in the power of order.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

OF THE DIVISION OF THE LESSER TITLES, AND SMALLER CONGREGATIONS OR CHURCHES, OUT OF THOSE CHURCHES OF SO LARGE EXTENT, FOUNDED AND CONSTITUTED BY THE APOSTLES.

HITHERTO we have seen how the apostles, dividing the Churches in such sort that a whole city and the places adjoining made but one Church, set over the same one bishop,

¹ Lib. I. De Clericis, cap. 14.

² De Sacram. Ord. Lib. I. cap. 5.

³ Book III. Cap. 39. [Vol. I. p. 324.]

as pastor of the place, and divers presbyters, as assistants unto him. But in process of time we shall find certain portions of these greater flocks of Christ, and Churches of God, to have been divided out and distinctly assigned to several presbyters, that were to take the care and charge thereof, yet with limitations and reservations of sundry pre-eminences to the bishop, as remaining still pastor of those smaller particular congregations, though in a sort divided and distinguished from that greater Church, wherein especially he made his abode. Two words we find in antiquity¹ used to express the flocks of Christ, and Churches of God, thus divided for more convenience, and yet still depending on that care of one pastor or bishop, *παροικία* and *διοίκησις*, that is, parish and diocese. The former contained the citizens and all such borderers as dwelt near and repaired to any chief church or city, though now we use the word parish to signify another thing; namely, some particular, smaller and less congregation, divided out from the mother-church: the latter, which is diocese, both then and now importeth the villages and churches dispersed in divers places, under the regiment of one bishop.

The first that began thus to divide out smaller churches and congregations out of those great ones first founded, and

¹ "The villages and country towns as they were converted to the faith, and by reason of the number that believed needed a minister of the word and sacraments to be a resident among them, and were able and willing to maintain one, so repaired they to the bishop of the city next to them, and desired of him a fit man to serve their necessities, and became subject both the people and priest to that bishop, who first gained them to Christ, or who first erected and ordered their churches. By which means each bishop had not only his principal church and chair in that city, where he was pastor, which the ancient councils and stories call *παροικία*, but had the care and oversight of the towns and villages round about that city, which they call *διοίκησις*: for *παροικία* doth not import a country parish as our age abuseth the word; and whereon some unwisely have collected that every such parish had and should have a bishop; but the greatest cities, with their suburbs, and the chiefest churches in the world were so termed, as appeareth by Eusebius calling Alexandria, Corinth, Jerusalem, Ephesus, Lyons, Carthage, Antioch, and such other famous cities and churches, by the name of *παροικίαι*. The like is extant in the same writer, Lib. iv. cap. 1, 4, 5, 15, 19, 23; Lib. v. cap. 22, 23, 27; Lib. vi. cap. 1, 8, et Lib. vii. cap. 28, and in many other places."—Bilson, *The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*, Chap. ii. [p. 184. Lond. 1610.]

to assign presbyters distinctly to take care of them, was Evaristus¹ bishop of Rome, whose example others did follow in all parts of the world. These parts of God's Church thus divided, and assigned to the care of several presbyters, were called *tituli*, that is, "titles," because God was intitled unto them, and did specially claim them as the lot of his inheritance. These titles, or smaller churches and congregations, were of divers sorts: for some were more principal, wherein baptism might be administered, and the like things performed, which were thereupon named baptismal churches: and in respect of meaner in time growing out of them and depending of them, mother-churches also. Other there were not having so great liberties. To such of these churches² as he pleased the bishop himself went and preached, one day in one of them, and another in another, carrying great companies with him, and drawing great multitudes to him; which solemn assemblies and meetings were named 'stations,' from their standing at prayers used in those times: and were like the mighty armies of God keeping their watches, and standing ready to encounter their furious and dangerous enemies. In this sort Gregory the Great went and preached in such churches in Rome as he thought fit, whose homilies and sermons then preached are yet extant, with the names of the particular churches or places where they were preached, which were thereupon named 'churches of station;' though now in another sense they call those churches of station, whither men out of devotion resorting to visit relics and monuments, are made partakers of ample indulgences and pardons, for days, years, nay hundreds

¹ "Evaristus, ut Damasus ait, titulos in urbe Roma presbyteris divisit."—Platina, *De Vitis Pontif. in Evaristo*. [p. 16. Colon. Ubior. 1600.]

² "Veteres Romani pontifices statis quibusdam diebus, præcipue que in quadragesima et festis, ad diversas urbis Romæ ecclesias accedebant, ubi sermone vel concione ad populum adstantem habita et oratione ad Deum facta, divina mysteria postea cum clero et populo Romano celebrantes participabant. Qui actus statio appellata est.... Joannes Diaconus libro secundo de vita sancti Gregorii Papæ, 'Stationes,' inquit, 'per basilicas, vel beatorum martyrum cœmeteria secundum quod hactenus plebs Romana quasi eo vivente certatim discurrit, sollicite ordinavit, per quas et ipse simul discurrens, dum adhuc eloqui prævaleret, quadraginta homilias evangelii coram ecclesia diverso tempore declamavit.'"—Onuphrius [Panvinus], in libello de Stationibus Urbis Romæ. [ad calc. Platinae, ut supra, p. 74.]

and thousands of years. In those times, when the ancient bishops of Rome were wont to go the churches of station, because all churches had not their quire and ministers fit to perform the service of God with that solemnity that was wished, there were some specially appointed for this purpose, that they might attend the bishop, and go with him in the days of station, that so nothing might be wanting to all joyful solemnity and divine exultation.

Those principal titles or parish-churches¹, as now we use to speak, that enjoyed the greatest liberties and privileges, were called cardinal titles, or churches; and those presbyters that attended the service of God in those principal or cardinal churches, were called cardinal-presbyters; and in process of time some amongst the deacons also, cardinal-deacons; and amongst the bishops of Italy, certain bishops were named cardinal-bishops. Neither were these cardinal presbyters only in the Church of Rome, but in other Churches also, as Duarenus² sheweth; whence it is that we read in the council of Melden³, that the bishop must canonically order the cardinal titles in the cities or suburbs; and that we read in Joannes Diaconus⁴, that Gregory called back the cardinals

¹ “Existimo nomen cardinalis primo impositum esse loco, et a loco derivatum ad personas. Dicebantur enim tituli cardinales quædam ecclesiæ principales ubi baptismus conferebatur; et dicebantur ecclesiæ vel tituli cardinales ad differentiam aliorum locorum sacrorum minus principalium. Inde autem presbyter qui eam ecclesiam regebat dicebatur presbyter cardinalis. Pari ratione diaconie cardinales erant loca quædam principalia in urbe distincta juxta numerum regionum, et qui in eis residebant diaconi dicebantur cardinales diaconi ab ecclesia videlicet cardinali quam tenebant.”—Bellarm. De Clericis, Lib. i. cap. 16. [Tom. ii. p. 137.]

² “Leo presbyteros cardinales meo judicio vocat non quosvis presbyteros, sed qui in majore ecclesia quam cathedralem dicimus rem divinam simul cum episcopo suo faciunt: canonici hodie appellati. Mitto quod in quibusdam civitatibus, cujusmodi Ravenna est et Compostella, etiamnum sacerdotes quidam præcipui hoc nomen retinent.”—Duaren. De Sacr. Eccles. Minist. Lib. i. cap. 13. [p. 1160. Francof. 1592.]

³ “Ut titulos cardinales in urbibus vel suburbiis constitutos episcopi canonice et honeste sine retractatione ordinent et disponant.”—Concil. Meldens. Can. LVII. [Labbe, Tom. ix. col. 978.]

⁴ “Cardinales violenter in parochiis ordinatos forensibus in pristinum cardinem Gregorius revocabat.”—Johannes Diaconus, in Vit. Greg. Lib. iii. cap. 11. [Inter Opp. Greg. Tom. iv. col. 88.]

violently ordained in the parishes abroad, into their ancient title again. Onuphrius¹, a great antiquary, giveth another reason of the name of Cardinal, supposing that they were called cardinal-priests and deacons in each church, which were over all the other priests and deacons of the same; for that they were chief priests and deacons, and of more principal esteem than the rest. But this conceit of his Bellarmine² refuteth, for that there were sometimes many cardinals in the same title, as appeareth by St Gregory in his Epistles. So that it seemeth more probable that cardinals are so named from the titles and churches which are cardinal and chief churches, enjoying greater liberties and privileges than others, than for that they are cardinal or chief amongst the priests of those their churches and titles.

But whatsoever was the reason that they were named cardinals, which perhaps cannot now be known, it is strange to see from how mean beginnings they have grown so great in state and dignity as therein to match and equal the greatest princes of the world. That at first they were but parish-priests of Rome (besides that it is confessed by all), it is most evident, for that yet still in this their greatness they are styled but cardinal-priests of such a title or parish-church in Rome; and that for a long time there was no more respect had to one presbyter than another, but all equally interested in the government of the Church were indifferently called to the election of the bishop, and his consultations, it is most clear and evident. Whereupon Cyprian³ writing to the clergy of Rome, writeth not to the cardinals only, but to all the priests and deacons of the Church of Rome. In the time of Gregory the Great, it may seem that all the presbyters were not called

¹ "Hinc presbyterorum cardinalium nomen manasse crediderim ut is videlicet esset presbyter cardinalis, id est, principalis, qui cæteris presbyteris ejusdem tituli præesset."—Onuphrius Panvinius, *De Episc. Tit. et Diacon. Cardinal.* [p. 6. Par. 1609.]

² "Hæc Onuphrii explicatio non videtur vera. Nam in eodem titulo plures erant aliquando cardinales, ut patet ex synodo S. Gregorii, ubi ponuntur subscriptiones presbyterorum cardinalium, et inter eas tres inveniuntur tituli sanctæ Balbinæ, duo sancti Damasi, duo sancti Sylvestri, duo sanctorum Apostolorum."—Bellarm. *De Clericis*, Lib. I. cap. 16. [p. 137.]

³ Cyprian, *Lib. III. Epist. 5, et 21.* [Al. *Epist. xx. et ix. pp. 42, et 18.*]

to the consultations of the bishop, but cardinal-presbyters only; for only four and thirty were present at the synod holden by him, and mentioned in his Epistles¹; whereas no doubt in his time there were many more presbyters of that great and large Church, seeing there were six and forty in the days of Cornelius in the time of persecution, when the greatest part of the city remained yet still in infidelity and heathenish superstition. But whether all the presbyters of the Church of Rome, or only some certain, were called to the consultations of the bishop in Gregory's time, it is certain that all the clergy had interest in the choice and election of the bishop. But afterwards, in process of time, the cardinals only had interest in the election of their bishop, and they and no other were admitted to sit in council with the bishop, all other presbyters being excluded. By which means the dignity of these cardinals was greatly increased. So that whereas before all bishops were preferred before those cardinals that were not bishops, and to be a cardinal was but a step to the degree of a bishop, as Onuphrius in his book of Cardinals sheweth, and as is collected out of the first book and seventh chapter of the life of Gregory; afterwards this order was changed, and the dignity of a bishop was made but a step to the degree and honour of a cardinal. Neither did they only exclude the rest of the clergy of the Church of Rome from the election of their bishop, and from sitting in the council with him; but whereas from the year three hundred to the year eight hundred after Christ, for the determining of all weighty matters concerning the Church the bishops of Italy were convoked to national synods, as it appeareth by the tomes of the councils, they excluded them also; so that the managing of the weighty affairs of the Church was wholly referred to these cardinals, the other being no longer called according to the old manner, though yet still they take an oath yearly to visit the apostolic thresholds, and to present themselves unto the Roman bishop their metropolitan, as they were wont to do, when being called by him to the national synods, they were bound to make their repair to Rome. Of this change Cardi-

¹ [Vide subscriptiones presbyterorum xxxiv. ad decretum Gregorii, Registr. Lib. iv. cap. 44. Al. Append. Epist. v. Tom. II. col. 1291. Par. 1705.]

nal Cusanus speaketh¹, showing that in his opinion the first step to the due reformation of the Church, were the choosing of these cardinals out of those several Churches which were heretofore interested in the deliberations of the Roman bishop, and the making of them to be but agents and procurators for them, and in their names, till such time as the bishops might be convoked again to national synods, as in former times they were wont to be. "From hence," saith Duarenus², "we may easily gather the same that the interpreter of the decrees somewhere writeth, that howsoever in time and by spoiling other of their right, the cardinals of the Church of Rome are grown exceeding great, yet in truth and indeed every bishop, of what city soever, is of greater dignity than any cardinal, priest, or deacon of the Romish Church: which thing," saith Duarenus, "if any man should doubt of, might easily be confirmed by the authority of St Augustine, in a certain Epistle to St Hierome, priest of the Roman Church, where he saith expressly: *Quanquam secundum vocabula, quæ usus obtinuit, episcopatus sit presbyterio major; Augustinus tamen Hieronymo minor est*: that is, "Although according to the titles which now are in use, it is a more honourable thing to be a bishop than a presbyter, yet Augustine is less than Hierome."

¹ "In finem universalis boni regiminis, quia plena universalia concilia difficulter colliguntur, hanc putarem primam radicem reformationum, ut cardinales ex legatis provinciarum constituerentur, quorum concilium cuncta gravia aut ordinationi universali canonum obvia cum subscriptione tam papæ quam cardinalium expedirentur."—Cusanus, De Concord. Cathol. Lib. II. cap. 18. [p. 742. Bas. 1565.]

"Juxta sanctorum patrum et canonum instituta omnes episcopi qui hujus apostolicæ sedis ordinationi subjacent qui propinqui sunt annue circa Idus Maii sanctorum principum apostolorum Petri et Pauli liminibus præsententur, omni occasione seposita: qui vero de longinquo juxta chirographum impleant."—[Gratian. Decret. Part. I.] Dist. XCIII. cap. 4. [col. 479. Par. 1612.]

² "Ex his facile est colligere quod interpres Decreti quodam in loco scribit; episcopi cujusque civitatis majorem quam diaconi vel presbyteri Romanæ ecclesiæ cardinalis dignitatem esse. Quod vel auctoritate Augustini confirmatur in quadam ad Hieronymum Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyterum epistola. 'Quanquam,' inquit, 'secundum vocabula quæ usus obtinuit, episcopatus sit presbyteris major, Augustinus tamen Hieronymo minor est.'"—Duarenus, De Sacr. Eccles. Minist. Lib. I. cap. 13. [p. 1160.]

His meaning is, in merit and personal worth : for otherwise, that there is no other reason of priests and deacons of the Church of Rome, than of any other city, in respect whereof Hierome, as priest of Rome, might be greater than Augustine being bishop of little Hippo in Africa, Hierome himself demonstrateth at large in his Epistle to Evagrius." But this proof of Duarenus perhaps will be found too weak, because it is greatly doubted, by some of excellent learning, whether Hierome were a priest of the Church of Rome, or not. Surely in his Epistle against John of Jerusalem¹, he termeth himself a priest of the Church of Antioch, and not of Rome. So that it may be probably thought, that howsoever for a time he were in Rome, and did help Damasus the bishop² in certain writings, matters of learning, and resolution of doubts, yet he never had any title or charge in the Roman Church. Bellarmine taketh great exception to Calvin for saying that Hierome was priest of the Romish Church³, which if he had been well advised, he should not have done (howsoever perhaps Calvin were deceived in that point), not only because many of his own friends have erred with Calvin in this point, if it be an error, but because they have for a long time in their churches, and all other places, painted him in his scarlet robes and red hat⁴, like a cardinal. And howsoever Bellarmine perhaps will not be much moved with these paintings, yet Campian, a great champion of the Roman Church, bringeth the painted glass windows of their churches as pregnant witnesses

¹ Epist. lxi. ad Pammachium, de Erroribus Johannis Hierosolymitani. [Vid. Tom. II. col. 451.]

² "Ante annos plurimos quum in chartis ecclesiasticis juvarem Damasum Romanæ urbis episcopum," &c.—Id. ad Gerontiam. [Sive Ageruchiam] De Monogamia. [Epist. cxxiii. Tom. I. col. 901.]

³ "'At,' inquit, Calvinus, 'Augustinus non quemvis presbyterum sed Hieronymum presbyterum Romanæ ecclesiæ episcopo postponit.' Respondeo, S. Hieronymum non Romanæ ecclesiæ sed Antiochenæ presbyterum fuisse."—Bellarm. De Clericis, Lib. I. cap. 16. [Tom. II. p. 138.]

⁴ "Innocent. IV. in concilio Lugduni habito plures cardinales creavit. Primusque fuit qui cardinalitiam dignitatem rubeo pileo adauxit, ea intentione ut admonerentur, teste Martino Polono, se semper paratos esse debere sanguinem pro Christiana religione profundere, præsertim eo tempore quo Romana ecclesia a Frederico secundo quondam imperatore vehementer oppugnabatur."—Bin. in Vita Innocentii IV. Concil. Tom. III. Part. 2. p. 1481. [Colon. Agripp. 1606.]

against us, which we may not except against; and *testes fenestræ* are not the meanest of those witnesses, which in his *Omne genus testium* (wherein he maketh a search in heaven, and raketh hell, to see who will speak for him, and depose against us) he produceth and bringeth to the bar. But to leave this proof of the dignity of bishops brought by Duarenus as uncertain, it is most certain which the same Duarenus hath, that cardinals of the Church of Rome in ancient time were not matchable in honour and dignity with the meanest bishop in the world; that they were but parish-priests and deacons of the Church of Rome, and bound by all canons to be resident in their parishes and titles, as all other priests and deacons are; and that they can no way justify their possessing of bishoprics, being no bishops, but presbyters and deacons only. What havoc and spoil these parish-priests have made throughout the whole Christian world, since they came to that greatness they are at now, by seizing into their hands the richest abbeyes, bishoprics, and archbishoprics, by virtue of the pope's provisions, not contenting themselves with one or two, but getting to themselves so great a number of the greatest dignities and church-livings, as is incredible, all stories report¹, and the woful experience of all Christendom doth sufficiently testify. If any man desire to see how the pope as a wild boar hath laid waste the vineyard of the Lord in former times, spoiling the Church and people of God for the enriching of these his cardinals, that so they might be equal in state and magnificence to the princes and potentates of the world, let him read that which Dr Reynolds² in his most learned and worthy Conference hath collected and gathered out of most authentical records, touching these Romish practices, to the everlasting shame and ignominy of the court of Rome; which long since, for the intolerable and insatiable covetousness thereof, Grostead³, the renowned bishop of Lincoln, fitly compared unto

¹ Nicolaus De Clamengiis, De corrupto ecclesiæ statu. [Passim. in Append. ad Fascic. rerum expetendarum, per Orthuinum Gratium, p. 555. Lond. 1690.]

² Conference with Hart, Chap. vii. Division 6. [Passim. pp. 307, sqq. Lond. 1609.]

³ "Cum hæc et alia enormia, videlicet omne genus avaritiæ, usuram, simoniam, et rapinam, omne genus luxuriæ, libidinem, gulam, et ornatum, quæ in curia illa regnant, detestaretur, ut vere de ipsa judicatur,

that behemoth, that thinketh he can drink up the whole river of Jordan: and saith, that among other the praises of the Romish court, these two are not the least, that *Ejus avaritiæ totus non sufficit orbis, ejus luxuriæ meretrix non sufficit omnis*: that is, "That the courtiers of the court of Rome are so insatiable in covetousness, that a whole world of wealth is not sufficient to satisfy their greedy desires; and so impure in their filthy lust, that all the stews in the world are not able to give them content."

CHAPTER XXIX.

OF CHOREPISCOPI, OR RURAL BISHOPS, FORBIDDEN BY OLD CANONS TO ENCROACH UPON THE EPISCOPAL OFFICE; AND OF THE INSTITUTION AND NECESSARY USE OF ARCH-PRESBYTERS, OR DEANS.

FOR the more easy governing of their Churches, in number many, and in place far distant one from another, some of the bishops in ancient times communicated part of their authority to some principal men, which in places far remote from them supplied their absence, and performed some things pertaining to them. These were called *Chorepiscopi*, either for that they were χωρικοὶ ἐπίσκοποι; that is, rural bishops; or else for that they were instead of the bishops, and in many things supplied their places, and did their duties. The first institution of these, as it appeareth by the council of Neocæsarea¹, and Damasus², in his epistle written concerning these

Ejus avaritiæ totus non sufficit orbis,

Ejus luxuriæ meretrix non sufficit omnis,

nitebatur prosequi, quomodo, confisi cura illa ut 'Jordanus influat in os ejus,' patulo hiatu aspirabat ut etiam bona intestatorum et distincte legatorum sibi usurparent; et ut licentius hoc facerent, regem in rapinis suis consortem facerent et participem," &c.—Grosthead, apud, Matth. Paris. Hist. Angl. In Henrico. III. [p. 754. Lond. 1684.]

¹ "Οἱ δὲ χωρεπίσκοποι, εἰσὶ μὲν εἰς τύπον τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα, ὡς δὲ συν-
λειτουργοὶ διὰ τὴν σπουδὴν εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς προσφέρουσι τιμώμενοι."—
Concil. Neocæs. Can. XIII. [Al. XIV. Labbe, Tom. I. col. 1513.]

² "Quod chorepiscopi ad formam septuaginta instituti erant canon
sufficienter manifestat, ubi ait; Chorepiscopi quoque ad exemplum

rural bishops, was specially that they might be assistant to the bishop in receiving such contributions, oblations, and set rents, as were for the maintenance of the bishop and his clergy, the relief of the poor and needy, and the entertainment of strangers; as also in taking care of the poor, and providing for them out of the common treasury, the bishop himself being far off. Afterwards, in process of time, there were some bishops that put over unto these the care, execution, and performance of such things as properly pertained to themselves, that they might take their ease, and attend their own private affairs: like harlots, that put out their children to be nursed by others, that themselves in the meanwhile may satisfy their lusts, as a great bishop¹, not without some bitterness, speaketh. Whence it came that these *chorepiscopi* waxed proud and insolent, and in the end, being but presbyters, presumed to ordain priests and deacons, and to do such things as none but bishops ought to do; whereupon they were controlled by the learned bishops that lived in those times, and the councils holden by them. Damasus so far disliketh their presumption in ordaining priests and deacons, that he will not have them to ordain subdeacons, or inferior clerks². The councils of Ancyra³ and Hispalis⁴, Leo the Great⁵ and John the Third⁶,

et formam septuaginta videntur esse, et reliqua.”—Damas. Epist. v. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1027.]

¹ “Illi namque episcopi qui talia præsumunt videntur mihi esse meretricibus similes, quæ statim ut pariunt infantes suos aliis meretricibus tradunt educandos, ut suam citius libidinem explere valeant.”—Id. Ibid. [col. 1026.]

² “Eis non licet sacerdotes consecrare, nec diaconos aut subdiaconos.”—Ibid. [col. 1028.]

³ “Χωρεπισκόποις μὴ ἐξείναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν.”—Concil. Ancyra. Can. XII. [Al. XIII. Tom. I. col. 1492.]

⁴ “Quamvis cum episcopis plurima illis ministeriorum communis sit dispensatio, quædam novellis et ecclesiasticis regulis sibi prohibita noverint; sicut presbyterorum et diaconorum ac virginum consecratio, hæc enim omnia illicita esse presbyteris, [presbyteris vel chorepiscopis, marg.] quia pontificatus apicem non habent, quem solis deberi episcopis auctoritate canonum præcipitur.”—Concil. Hispal. II. Can. 7. [Tom. VI. col. 1406.]

⁵ Leo. Epist. LXXXVI. al. LXXXVIII. [Sive epist. falso Leoni ascript. ubi verba fere eadem. vid. dissert. Quesnelli. Tom. II. col. 1272. Ven. 1756.]

⁶ “Perlatum est ad sedem apostolicam, ... quod quidam chorepisc-

forbid them the ordaining of priests and deacons, mentioning not the other inferior clerks. The council of Antioch¹ saith, “the rural bishops that have received imposition of hands of bishops, and have been ordained as bishops, may ordain subdeacons, and other inferior clerks; but priests or deacons, without the bishop of the city, or, as some read it, without the privity of the bishop of the city, they may not;” thereby insinuating that with his consent they may. Out of which council Bellarmine² collecteth two things. The first, that in the primitive Church there were two sorts of *chorepiscopi*, or rural bishops; whereof the former had episcopal ordination,

copi, ultra modum suum progredientes, donum sancti spiritus per impositionem manuum tradant, et alia quæ solum pontificibus debentur, contra fas peragant.”—Johannes Papa. III. In epist. ad Episcopos Germaniæ et Galliæ. [Sive epist. falso Johanni ascript. Labbe, Tom. vi. col. 502.]

¹ “Τοὺς ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, ἢ ταῖς χώραις, ἢ τοὺς καλουμένους χωρεπισκόπους, εἰ καὶ χειροθεσίαν εἶεν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες, ἔδοξε τῇ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ εἰδέναι τὰ ἐαυτῶν μέτρα, καὶ διοικεῖν τὰς ὑποκειμένας αὐτοῖς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῇ τούτων ἀρκεῖσθαι φροντίδι καὶ κηδεμονίᾳ, καθιστᾶν δὲ ἀναγνώστας, καὶ ὑποδιακόνους, καὶ ἐφορκιστὰς, καὶ τῇ τούτων ἀρκεῖσθαι προαγωγῇ· μήτε πρεσβύτερον μήτε διάκονον χειροτονεῖν τολμᾶν δίχα τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπου, ᾧ ὑποκείνται αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ χώρα.”—Concil. Antioch. can. x. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 589.]

² “Respondeo quosdam fuisse chorepiscopos qui vere episcopalem consecrationem acceperant, sed chorepiscopi dicebantur, quod non haberent propriam ecclesiam sed in aliena dioecesi ministrarent, quales sunt hoc tempore episcopi quidam titulares qui et suffraganei dici solent. Alios vero chorepiscopos fuisse qui nihil aliud nisi presbyteri essent, sed in pagis ac villis seu etiam oppidis episcopum aliquo modo repræsentarent. De prioribus loqui videtur concilium Antiochenum, ut etiam Damasus annotavit, ubi non de omnibus chorepiscopis loquitur concilium, sed de illis tantum qui a pluribus episcopis ritu pontificum sunt consecrati. Præterea in eodem canone concilium non solum his chorepiscopis permittit ut subdiaconos absolute ordinent, sed etiam ut presbyteros et diaconos ordinare possint, si id episcopus loci permiserit, ex quo certe sequitur eos chorepiscopos veros episcopos fuisse.

“Porro in fine illius canonis, ubi legimus, ‘Chorepiscopus ab episcopo loci ordinandus est,’ non de iisdem chorepiscopis agitur, sed de altero genere. Voluit enim concilium legem statuere ut deinceps chorepiscopus ordinetur ab uno episcopo, et proinde presbyter sit, non episcopus. De quo genere chorepiscoporum loquitur Damasus, cum dicit non licere chorepiscopis ordinare subdiaconos.”—Bellarm. De Clericis, Lib. i. cap. 17. [Tom. ii. p. 139.]

that is, were ordained of three bishops, like the suffragan bishops of our time; the latter were but presbyters. The second, that the council appointing the rural bishop to be ordained by the bishop of the city, meant to forbid that there should be any more such rural bishops as have episcopal ordination, whereunto the concurrence of three bishops at the least is required: and thereupon he thinketh, the council of Antioch permitting rural bishops to ordain sub-deacons, and the decretal of Damasus forbidding them so to do, may be reconciled; for that the council permitting the ordination of sub-deacons to rural bishops speaketh of such as were ordained of three bishops; and the decretal of Damasus forbidding them to meddle in such ordination of such as were but mere presbyters. But whosoever shall take a view of the decretal epistle of Damasus¹, shall find that he condemneth the intermeddling of any rural bishops whatsoever in ordination, and shutteth them out of the Church, as men that neither have nor can have any place in the same. “What is *chorepiscopus*,” saith Damasus¹, “but a country bishop? and if he be a country bishop, what doth he in the city? the canon altogether forbidding that

¹ “Cum dixit chorepiscopum, profecto villanum voluit intelligi episcopum. Et si villanus, quid agit in civitate, cum in civitate duo omnino prohibeantur esse episcopi? Et si in villa et in eo loco ubi antea episcopi non fuerunt, cum et in modica civitate vel in villa aut castello episcopus fieri prohibeatur, et in omnibus omnino locis ubi antea episcopi non fuerunt ne vilescat auctoritas et nomen episcopi fuerint constituti, quid rogo erunt? Ecce nec locus cum ordinatione concordat, nec ordinatio cum loco, quoniam si episcoporum manus impositionem perceperunt et ut episcopi sunt consecrati ubi sunt consecrati? Ad villam, quia *χώρα* villa est apud Græcos. Et qualiter ad villam, si nec in castello aut in modica civitate licet fieri, rogo ut promatis; et si promere non potestis quia (scio) per rationem aut plenam auctoritatem minime potestis, digitum ori imponite, et eos omni auctoritate carere non dubitate, scilicet quia tria obstant quibus eorum cassatur actio vel institutio: unum quod ab uno episcopo ordinari solent, in quo eorum ordinatio a canonibus discordat, qui per manus episcoporum eos institui jubent. Aliud si a pluribus episcopis sunt ordinati, et aut in villa, aut in castello, seu in modica civitate, aut omnino non in eo loco præfixi quo juste episcopi fieri debent, aut dudum non fuerunt, ubi vilescat auctoritas et nomen episcopi, aut si in civitate cum altero episcopo; cum in una civitate duo non debeant consistere episcopi. Tertium si absolute fuerint instituti, sicut de quibusdam audivimus; quæ omnia episcopali omnino carent auctoritate.”—Damas. ubi supra. [col. 1027.]

there should be two bishops in one city. If he be not in the city, but in some country village, and in such place where there never was any bishop before (the canon forbidding bishops to be ordained in mean cities, villages, or forts, or in any place whatsoever where bishops have not been placed in former time, lest the authority and name of bishops grow into contempt), what, I pray you, shall he be? For, behold, neither doth the place agree with his ordination, nor his ordination with the place; because, if such rural bishops have received the imposition of the hands of many bishops, and have been ordained as bishops, they should not have been consecrated in a country village, such as the Greek word *χώρα* importeth; the canon forbidding bishops to be placed in villages, small forts, or little cities. Give me therefore a reason," saith he, "I pray you, of the constituting of these men: or if you cannot, as I know you cannot, lay your hand on your mouth, and assure yourselves that they have no place nor authority in the Church of God, divers things making void their ordination, and whatsoever thing they attempt to do by virtue of such ordination: whereof the first is, for that they are wont to be ordained by one bishop, wherein their ordination is against the canons concerning bishops, which will have bishops ordained by the imposition of the hands of three bishops at the least: the second, for that if they be ordained by many bishops, yet they are placed in some village, little fort, or small city; or at least in some such place where lawfully bishops may not be ordained, or formerly have not been, and where the authority and name of a bishop will grow into contempt; or if they be placed in a city, they are placed there with another bishop, whereas the canons permit not two bishops in one city: the third is, for that if they have been ordained at large, and neither placed in city nor country village, as it hath been reported unto us of some, their ordination is void, because the canons do void all ordinations at large: so that which way soever we turn us, we shall find that these men neither have nor can have any episcopal authority or place." This is the resolution of this great Roman bishop, who wholly rejecteth this kind of rural bishops, and will not have them at all to intermeddle in any thing peculiarly pertaining to the episcopal office.

But some man will say, May not a bishop when he is

grown aged, infirm, and unable to sustain and bear the weight of that great office, have a coadjutor or assistant? Surely there is no doubt but that he may have one joined unto him to bear part of his burthen; but that that other should have episcopal ordination, the canons permit not: whereupon St Augustine, now aged, and distracted with multiplicity of manifold businesses concerning the state of the whole Church, desirous, with the consent of his clergy and people, to have Eradius, a presbyter of his Church, joined unto him as a coadjutor while he lived, and designed to succeed him after his death, would by no means have him ordained a bishop, but to continue a presbyter still, though himself had been ordained a bishop, while Valerius yet lived. His words are these¹: *Adhuc in corpore posito beatæ memoriæ patre et episcopo meo Valerio, episcopus ordinatus sum, et sedi cum illo: quod concilio Niceno prohibitum fuisse nesciebam, nec ipse sciebat. Quod ergo reprehensum est in me, nolo reprehendi in filio meo: erit presbyter ut est; quando Deus voluerit, futurus episcopus. Obsecro vos, et obstringo per Christum, ut huic juveni, huic presbytero Eradio², quem hodie in Christi nomine designo episcopum successorem mihi, patiamini refundere onera occupationum mearum, &c.*, that is, “While my father and bishop, Valerius, yet lived, I was ordained a bishop, and sat together with him; which I knew not to have been forbidden in the Nicene council, neither did he know it. What therefore was disliked in me I will not have to be blamed in my son; he shall continue a presbyter as he is; and when God will he shall be a bishop. I beseech you, and earnestly entreat you for Christ’s sake, that you will give me leave in some sort to ease myself, and to cast the burthen of my employments upon the shoulders of this young man, this presbyter Eradius, whom this day in the name of Christ I appoint and design the bishop that shall succeed me. My counsel shall not be wanting to him, neither will I fail to supply what shall be any way defective or wanting in him.” Thus we see a coadjutor was allowed, but yet such a one as should be but a presbyter: and therefore long after the time of Augustine, when Zacharias³, bishop

¹ August. Epist. cx. [Al. Epist. cxiii. Tom. ii. col. 790.]

² [Al. “Eraclio” vel “Heraclio.”]

³ “Cum esset senex [Bonifacius], petiit a Zacharia si posset in ecclesia Moguntinensi alium idoneum loco sui ordinare episcopum. Cui

of Rome, associated another bishop as a coadjutor to Bonifacius, the bishop of Mentz, he confessed it to be a thing that was forbidden, and worthy reprehension; but that upon his importunity, of special favour, he had yielded so much unto him, that he might have such a coadjutor, whom with the advice of his brethren he might appoint to succeed him when he should die. But notwithstanding the canons forbidding any such thing to be done, and the dislike of many the greatest bishops of the world, yet in the later ages of the Church, the bishops giving themselves to ease, or attending secular businesses, and greatly neglecting their episcopal function, again reduced into the Church these rural bishops, whom they named suffragans. To these they committed the doing of such things as are most proper unto bishops, as ordination and confirmation, but kept the power of jurisdiction to themselves, or gave it to some other, and not to these: contrary to the example of St Augustine, that put over to Eradius the hearing of causes, and the performing of things pertaining to jurisdiction, himself only directing and overseeing him, but held still himself that which is most properly episcopal. "Such bishops," Melchior Canus¹, entreating of councils, and the persons whereof coun-

Zacharias, alioqui reprehensibile, ex gratia singulari concessit quod posset sibi ordinare coadjutorem episcopum, quem et decedens sibi substituere valeret concilio fratrum successorem; de quo 7, qu. i. c. petiisti."—Naucler. Chronogr. Tom. II. Generat. 26. p. 667. [Colon. 1579.]

["Petiisti ut cum nostro consulto pro superveniente tibi senectute, atque corporis imbecillitate, si poteris invenire alium in eadem sede in qua præes, pro tui persona debeas collocare. Nos vero, adjutore Deo, consilium præbemus tuæ sanctitati, ut pro salute animarum rationabilium, fautore Christo sedem quam obtines Moguntinæ ecclesiæ nequaquam relinquis. Si vero Dominus dederit juxta petitionem tuam hominem perfectum, qui possit sollicitudinem habere et curam pro salute animarum, pro tui persona illum ordinabis episcopum, eritque in evangelio tibi credito et ministerio Christi portando in omni loco requirens et confortans ecclesiam Dei."—Epist. Zachariæ Papæ in Gratiani Decreto.] Part. 2. Caus. VII. Quæst. 1. cap. 'Petiisti.' [Cap. 17. col. 896, Par. 1612.]

¹ "Non patrum memoria nisi episcopi et presbyteri in concilium vocantur. Nec hi omnes, sed qui pastores ecclesiæ et rectores sunt. Episcopi enim quos annulares nostri vocant, sine causa aliquando in synodum sunt admissi. Sed nihil mirum. Nam et sine causa in ecclesia sunt."—Melchior Canus, Loc. Theolog. Lib. v. cap. 2. [p. 243. Colon. Agripp. 1605.]

cils consist, saith, “are so far from having any place or voice in the councils, that they neither have nor ought to have any place in the Church at all.”

But whatsoever we think of these, the bishops in former times, for the better governing of their Churches, chose out certain of their presbyters to assist them in the supervision and direction of the rest, whom they first named arch-presbyters, and afterwards deans. The name of *decanus*, or dean, being first used to note out such a prefect, or governor of monks, as had the rule of ten monks living together in common: and in this sense the name of a dean is found in St Augustine¹. The arch-presbyters, which bishops anciently appointed to assist them, were of two sorts, *Urbani* and *Vicani*², that is, such as lived in the great church in the city, and such as lived abroad in the country, and were thereupon named rural arch-presbyters, or rural deans. Touching the former, who lived in the great church in the city, because the bishop alone, either in respect of absence or employments could not execute all things that pertained to the service belonging to his place, nor give particular direction to every other what he should do, they were chosen out of the whole number of presbyters, partly to execute and perform what the bishop in his own

The bishops he speaketh of, he calleth annular bishops, haply for that whereas full bishops had both staff and ring, expressing their jurisdiction as well as their espousing to the Church, these had the ring only.

¹ “Opus suum tradunt [cœnobitæ] eis quos decanos vocant, eo quod sint denis propositi, ut neminem illorum cura sui corporis tangat.”—August. De Moribus Eccles. Cathol. [Lib. i. cap. 31. Tom. i. col. 710, E.]

² “Sunt archipresbyterorum duo genera: quorum urbani quidam dicuntur, quidam vicani. Urbani dicuntur qui in urbe et in majore ecclesia officio suo funguntur. . . . Cum namque episcopus propter absentiam forte vel occupationes suas non possit omnia episcopi munia vel solus vel una cum presbyteris obire, sed curas suas cum iis partiri necesse habeat, utilius visum est ex presbyteris unum cæteris præponere, qui ea quæ ad presbyterorum officium pertinent partim ipse exsequatur, partim aliis facienda præscribat. . . . Archipresbyteri vicani nullam in urbe potestatem, nullum ministerium habent, sed in majoribus celebrioribusque pagis constituuntur. Ac singulis præter ecclesiæ propriæ curationem, certarum ecclesiarum certorumque presbyterorum, qui videlicet per minores titulos habitant inspectio observatioque committitur.”—Duaren. De Sacr. Eccles. Minist. Lib. i. cap. 8. [p. 1157.]

person should have done, and partly to prescribe to others what they should do. The rural arch-presbyters had the oversight and direction of the presbyters that were placed in the lesser titles, or meaner churches, abroad in the country. Concerning these we find it thus decreed: *Ut singulæ plebes archipresbyterum habeant, qui non solum imperiti vulgi sollicitudinem gerat, sed etiam presbyterorum qui per minores titulos habitant, vitam jugi circumspeditione custodiat, qua quisque industria divinum opus exerceat, episcopo enunciet; nec contendat episcopus non egere plebem archipresbytero, quasi ipse eam gubernare valeat; quia etsi valde idoneus sit, decet tamen ut sua onera partiatur, ut sicut ipse matrici ecclesiæ præest, ita archipresbyteri præsent plebibus, ut in nullo titubet ecclesiastica sollicitudo; cuncta tamen referant ad episcopum, nec aliquid contra ejus decretum ordinare præsumant*¹; that is, “That each division of the people of God, in their several limits, have their arch-presbyter, who may not only take care of the rude and ignorant multitude, but may also, with continual circumspedition, observe and look unto the life and conversation of the presbyters which dwell in the lesser titles, and show unto the bishop with what diligence each of them performeth the work of God. Neither let the bishop contend and say, that the people committed to his charge need no arch-presbyter, as if he himself were able sufficiently to govern the same; because, though he be exceeding worthy, yet it is fit he should divide his burthens, that as he is over the mother-church, so the arch-presbyters may be over the people abroad, that the ecclesiastical care stagger not, or be not too weak in anything. Yet, notwithstanding, let them refer all things to the bishop, neither let them presume to order anything against his liking and decree.” These rural arch-presbyters were to be chosen by the clergy, and confirmed by the bishop, and being so placed, might not be removed without the consent of the clergy. *Archipresbyterum, saith the second council of Turone, sine omnium presbyterorum consensu de loco dejicere episcopus non præsumat: quem autem negligentia ejicit, cum omnium presbyterorum consilio refutetur*²: that is, “Let not the bishop

¹ Decret. Greg. IX. Ex Synod. habit. Ravennæ, Lib. i. Tit. 25. [Al. 24. cap. 4. col. 301. Par. 1612.]

² Concil. Turonens. ii. can. 7. [Labbe, Tom. vi. col. 536.]

presume to remove or put an arch-presbyter from his place, without the consent of the presbyters; but when the negligence of any one of these maketh him worthy to be ejected and put out, let him be rejected with the counsel and advice of all the presbyters." Touching the power and authority of these arch-presbyters: first, they were to admonish such as they saw to live scandalously, or any way to offend, as well laymen as clergymen; and the council of Antisiodorum decreeth¹, that if any lay or secular man shall contemn and despise the information and admonition of the arch-presbyter, he shall be kept from entering or setting his feet within the thresholds of the holy church, till he shall submit himself to the wholesome information and admonition. Secondly, they were twice in the year to visit all the churches within the limits subject to them, to see what was there amiss, defective, or weak, that so they might either reform, supply, or strengthen and confirm the same². Thirdly, they were to receive warrants from the bishop or his substitute, and by virtue thereof to cite all such to make their appearance before the chief pastor or bishop, as were upon any occasion to be convented before him³; and this their citation of such parties to be convented, under the seal of their office they were to certify the bishop of. Fourthly, they were to hold chapters in a set course, four times in the year, and at other times, as often as urgent occasions should require⁴; and all parish-ministers, within a

¹ "Si qui ex secularibus institutionem aut admonitionem archipresbyteri sui contumacia faciente audire distulerit, tamdiu a liminibus sanctæ ecclesiæ habeatur extraneus quamdiu tam salubrem institutionem adimplere non studuerit."—Concil. Antisiodorens. can. XLIV. [Labbe, Tom. VI. col. 646.]

² "Hos [scil. archipresbyteros, sive archidiaconos, Græce chorepiscopos] etiam senis quibusque mensibus districtus seu regiunculæ suæ ecclesias suas visitare, et de omnibus rebus tam spiritualibus quam temporalibus sibi occurrentibus habere curam præcipuam."—Synod. Augustens. [Apud. Jover. ut infra, fol. 49, A.]

³ "Statuimus quod hujusmodi citationes primariæ dictorum ordinariarum fiendæ auctoritate per rectores aut alios prædictos de cætero non mandentur, sed fiant per officiales, decanos, apparitores, aut ministros alios eorundem."—Linwood [Provincial.] II. De Judiciis. [Tit. 1. p. 90, Oxon. 1679.]

⁴ "Omnibus et singulis co-episcopis et suffraganeis nostris in virtute obedientiæ, et sub pœna suspensionis ab officio et beneficio quam in ipsos ferimus si sponte circa hoc fuerint negligentes, firmiter injun-

year after their being possessed of their livings, were to swear to the dean, and so to be admitted as brethren to sit in chapter with him, and to be bound to come to the yearly chapters, and otherwise also, when as upon urgent cause the dean shall call a chapter; and to bear part of the charge¹. This oath which the ministers were to take before they were admitted to sit in chapter, was not simple, but with this limitation, *salvis juribus capituli*; that is, "no way to prejudice the rights of the chapter." In these chapters the arch-presbyters were to publish the decrees of provincial and episcopal synods, excluding laymen at such times as they published things precisely concerning the clergy, which otherwise might be present at the publication of things generally concerning all. Neither were they only to publish such decrees in their chapter, but to urge the execution of the same, to take notice of all places of ministry void, upon what occasion, and by whose fault they continued void, of all intrusion into places of ministry, and of the investiture of all such as newly entered into the charge of ministry, and the authority by which substitutes supply the places of other men. And besides, they were to admonish such as either by their visitation or other information they found to be faulty; and if by other good means they could not win them, to suspend laymen from the sacraments, and clergymen from the execution of their offices². But farther they might not go; but in case of

gendo mandamus quatenus constitutionem prædictam faciant in quatuor anni principalibus capitulis ruralibus per se vel saltem per decanos rurales vel gerentes eorum vices distincte et aperte coram toto capitulo exclusis laicis recitari."—Id. Lib. I. De Constitutionibus. [Tit. 2. p. 11, sqq.]

¹ "In omnibus aliis archipresbyteratibus et sedium Christianitatis decanatibus nostræ diœcesis, volumus et mandamus quod omnium et singularum ecclesiarum parochialium curatus intra annum a die acceptæ possessionis per se vel procuratorem legitimum præstet juramentum decano: quo præstito in fratrem recipiatur, et salvis juribus capituli consuetis decanus nunc et posthac a sic recepto habebit pro se unum aureum Rhenensem. Et tenebitur quilibet in capitulis generalibus et annalibus, et similiter, quando necessitate occurrente decanus capitulum indicit sub pœnis consuetis comparere."—Concil. Trevirens. II. De Decanis Christianitatis. [Can. 13. Labbe, Tom. XIX. col. 1452.]

² "Archipresbyter seu camerarius aut vicinior confrater curatus omnibus cæteris confratribus archipresbyteratus hujusmodi et etiam religiosi in eo commorantibus infra biduum proximum hoc idem faci-

obstinate continuance of disordered persons in their misdemeanors, notwithstanding these proceedings, they were to complain to the bishop if the matter required haste, or otherwise to the next episcopal synod. For the bishop in each diocese having certain thus appointed to assist and help him in the supervision of the rest, as well of the clergy as the people, was once in the year to hold a synod with the chief of his prelates, deans rural, and other worthy men. *Annis singulis*, saith Gratian¹, *episcopus in sua diœcesi synodum faciat de suis clericis et abbatibus, et discutiat alteros clericos, et monachos*: that is, "Let the bishop every year hold a synod in his diocese of his clerks and abbots; and let him therein discuss and examine the learning, conversation, and behaviour of other clerks and monks." The synod of Coleine, under Adolphus², confirmed by Charles the Fifth, appointed this diocesan synod to be holden twice every year, according to the old manner and custom. And the synod of Coleine, under Hermannus³, ordaineth that the bishop, or his official general, with the prelates of the metropolitical, cathedral, and collegiate churches, especially the archdeacons and deans rural, who in some part are taken into the fellowship of the bishop's cares, shall inquire into things out of order; and what he shall find by their judgment to need reformation, he shall with their advice amend and reform. The like doth Lauren-

nus manifestet, ac interdictum per eos, et in toto archipresbyteratu servandum fore notificet, quibus super his fidem plenam sicut nostris litteris volumus adhiberi."—Statut. Synodal. Episc. Hildemens. [Apud Jover. Sanctt. Eccles. Class. II. Sect. 3. fol. 41, B. Par. 1555.]

¹ Decret. Part. I. Dist. xviii. cap. 'Annis.' [col. 95, Par. 1585.]

"Reperimus nonnullas diœcesanas esse ecclesias destitutas; ob quam rem in hac constitutione decrevimus ut antiquæ consuetudinis ordo servetur, et annuis vicibus ab episcopo diœcesano visitentur."—Concil. Tarracon. can. 8. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 699.]

² "Statuimus ut synodus diœcesana quotannis bis pro veteri quidem more sed juxta reformationis formulam religiosius meliori cum fructu celebretur."—Concil. Colon. [Apud Jover. ubi supra, fol. 670, A.]

³ "In his conciliis, anno bis, de his omnibus apud metropolitanæ cathedralium collegiatarum monasteriorumque prælatos, et præsertim archidiaconos, et quos vocamus decanos rurales, (qui vocati sunt in partem sollicitudinis episcopalis) per vicarium nostrum in pontificalibus ac officialem disquisitio diligens fiat. Et quæ ex illorum judicio reformatione opus habere comperientur communi consilio emendentur."—Concil. Colon. sub Hermanno. [Apud Jover. fol. 30, B.]

tius¹, the pope's legate, decree and ordain. Yea, the council of Trent² confirmeth the same also; and the council of Coleine, under Adolphus³, taketh order that deans of colleges coming to the episcopal synod in the name of their colleges, and rural deans in the name of the parish-ministers within their divisions, shall have their charges borne by such their colleges and ministers according to the number of days the synod endureth, seeing they go on warfare for God. The form of holding a diocesan synod Joverius out of Burchardus describeth in this sort⁴. At a convenient hour when it seemeth good to the bishop or his vicegerent, all other doors being locked, let the ostiaries stand at that by which the presbyters are to enter, and coming together let them go in and sit according to their ordination; after these the approved deacons which order shall require to be present; let some laymen also of good conversation be brought in; and then let the bishop or his substitute enter; who entering into the synod, is first to salute the clergy and people, and then turning towards the east to say a certain prayer; and the deacons to read the gospel: "When it was late the first day of the sabbath, and the doors

¹ "Priscum synodorum morem renovare cupientes statuimus et ordinamus, ut singulo anno saltem synodus diocesana opportuno tempore a singulis episcopis celebretur cum potioribus prælatis, decanis ruralibus, virisque dignis."—Reformat. Cleri Germaniæ per Laurentium legatum Clementis VII. apud Jover. Class II. Sect. 3. [fol. 34, B.]

² "Provincialia concilia sicubi ommissa sunt pro moderandis moribus, corrigendis excessibus, controversiis componendis, aliisque ex sacris canonibus permissis, renoventur. Quare metropolitani per seipsos, seu illis legitime impeditis, co-episcopus antiquior intra annum ad minus a fine præsentis concilii, et deinde quolibet saltem triennio post octavam paschæ resurrectionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, seu alio commodiori tempore pro more provinciæ non prætermittat synodum in provincia sua cogere....Synodi quoque diocesanae quotannis celebrentur."—Concil. Trident. Sess. xxiv. cap. 2. [Labbe, Tom. xx. col. 157.]

³ "Decani collegiorum accedentes synodum pro suis collegiis in legionis officio et dignitate sua conservandis, et decani rurales pro suæ regiunculæ parochis Deo utique militant. Nemo vero, ut apostolus ait, militat unquam stipendiis suis. Propterea decernimus et statuimus ut pro numero dierum quibus concilium durat, conferant decanis suis collegia et parochi subsidia in sumptus quos necessario facere debent, absque omni tergiversatione."—Concil. Colon. sub Adolph. [Apud Jover. fol. 70, A.]

⁴ Jover. Class. II. Sect. 2. [fol. 136, sqq.]

were shut," &c.: after which reading and prayers all are to go out save the presbyters and clerks only: and after departure of the rest, another prayer being made, the bishop shall will the presbyters to propose their doubts, and either to learn or teach, and to make known their complaints, that so they may receive satisfaction. This is all that is done the first day. The second day, if the clergy have no matter of complaint or doubt, let the laity be let in to propose their doubts, and make known their grievances, or otherwise let their coming in be deferred till some other day. Besides this synod, which every bishop was to hold once every year, he was to go from church to church, and to see all the churches in his diocese. The second council of Bracar¹ appointeth that the bishop shall go through all his churches informing both presbyters and people; and the third² council of Arles³ prescribeth that he shall enquire and take notice of the wrongs offered to those of mean and poor estate, by them that are great and in authority, and first seek to reform such evils by episcopal admonition and counsel: but if he cannot so prevail, he shall acquaint the king with it. "The bishop," saith the fourth council of Toledo⁴, "must go every year through his diocese, and see all his churches and parishes, that he

¹ "Placuit omnibus episcopis atque convenit, ut per singulas ecclesias episcopi per diöceses ambulantes primum discutiant clericos quomodo ordinem baptismi teneant, vel missarum et quæcunque officia in ecclesia peraguntur."—Concil. Bracar. II. [Al. iii. Can. 1. [Labbe, Tom. vi. col. 578.]

² [sixth.]

³ "Ut unusquisque episcopus semel in anno circumeat parochiam suam. Noverint sibi curam populorum et pauperum in protegendis ac defendendis impositam. Ideoque dum conspiciunt iudices ac potentes pauperum oppressores existere, prius eos sacerdotali admonitione redarguant; et si contempserint emendari, eorum insolentia regis auribus intimetur, ut quos sacerdotalis admonitio non flectit ad justitiam, regalis potestas ab improbitate coerceat."—[Concil. Arelat. vi. Can. 17. Labbe, Tom. ix. col. 325.]

⁴ "Episcopum per cunctas diöceses parochiasque suas per singulos annos ire oportet, ut exquirat quo unaquæque basilica in reparatione sui indigeat. Quod si ipse aut languore detentus aut aliis occupationibus implicatus id explere nequirit, presbyteros probabiles aut diaconos mittat, qui et redditus basilicarum, et reparationes, et ministrantium vitam inquirent."—Concil. Tolet. iv. can. 36. [Labbe, Tom. vi. col. 1461.]

may inquire what reparations the churches do need, and what other things be amiss. But if he be either detained by sickness, or so entangled with business that he cannot go, let him send some approved presbyters or deacons, which may not only consider of the ruins of each church and the needful reparations thereof, but inquire also into the life and conversation of the clergy and ministers." According to the decree and direction of this council, we shall find that bishops hindered by other employments, sickness, weakness, or age, so that they could not go in person to visit their churches, sent some of their chief presbyters or deacons, but especially the chief deacons, to perform the work of visitation for them; because they being the chief among the deacons, which are but church-servants, were more attendant about them for despatch of all public businesses than presbyters. These chief deacons or archdeacons at first they sent only to visit and to make report, but not to sententiate any man's cause, or to meddle with the correcting or reforming of any thing; but afterwards in process of time they were authorized to hear and determine the smallest matters, and to reform the lighter and lesser offences: and therefore in the council of Lateran¹, under Alexander the Third, it is ordered that the archdeacon shall not give sentence against any one; but in the council of Rhoane² it is appointed that the archdeacon and arch-presbyter shall be forerunners to the bishop, and shall reform the lighter and smaller things they find to be amiss.

Hence in time it came, that archdeacons much used by bishops, as most attendant on them in the visitation of their churches, and reforming some smaller disorders, at length by prescription claimed the correction of greater things, as having of long time put themselves into the exercise of such authority. And thus the deacons, or at least the chief of them, the archdeacons, (which at first might not sit in the presence of a

¹ "Archidiaconis de ecclesiastica institutione non videtur licere, nisi auctoritas episcoporum et consensus accesserit, in alios sententiam promulgare."—Concil. Lateran. III. De Sent. et Interlocut. [Part. xxxvi. cap. 4. Labbe, Tom. XIII. col. 583.]

² "Cum episcopus suam diocesim circuit archidiaconus vel archipresbyter eum præire debet, uno aut duobus diebus per parochias quas visitaturus est. . . . quicquid de minoribus et levioribus causis corrigere potest, emendare satagat."—Concil. Rhotomag. apud Jover. Class. II. Sect. 2. Ex Burchard. Lib. I. cap. 90. [fol. 144, B.]

presbyter, but being willed by him so to do,) in the end became, by reason of this their employment by the bishop, to be greater not only than the ordinary presbyters, but than the arch-presbyters themselves. And therefore it is confessed by all, that the archdeacon hath no authority or power of jurisdiction by virtue of his degree and order, but by prescription only: neither can he claim more than he can prescribe for; which his prescription is thought reasonable, because the bishop is supposed to have consented to his intermeddling in such parts of government as by prescription he may claim. Yet lest it might seem absurd for him that is only a deacon, to exercise jurisdiction over presbyters, the canon of the Church provideth, that no man shall possess the place of an archdeacon unless he have the ordination of a presbyter.

Besides the deans or arch-presbyters, which the bishops used for the governing and overseeing of certain parts of their diocese allotted to them, with such limitations as they pleased, and for counsel and advice in managing their weightiest affairs, and the archdeacons, which they used as spies in all places, and trusted with the despatch of what they thought fit; they had for their direction in cases of doubt, and for their ease in the multiplicity of their employments, certain¹ of their clergy skilful in the canons and laws of the Church, whom they used as officials to hear all manner of causes, and matters of instance between party and party, but suffered them not to meddle in the censuring and punishing of criminal things, or in any matter of office: but in case of absence, or sickness, they had vicars-general, that might do anything almost that pertaineth to the bishop's jurisdiction. The former are not only named officials, but chancellors, though the name of chancellor be not in this sense so ancient as the former. *Cancellarius*² originally and properly signifieth a notary or

¹ "*Vicarios generales.* Horum potestas differt ab officialium principalium potestate. Nam officiales dicuntur quibus causarum cognitio generaliter per habentes jurisdictionem ecclesiasticam committitur. Et in tales transfunditur cognitio causarum totius dioceseos, non tamen inquisitio, nec correctio, sive punitio criminum, nec possunt aliquos amovere a beneficiis, nec conferre beneficia, nisi specialiter fuerint talia eis commissa. Sed vicarii generales omnia prædicta facere possunt virtute officii, excepta collatione beneficiorum."—Annot. in Lyndwood. [Provincial.] Lib. II. De Sequestrationibus. [p. 104, Oxon. 1679.]

² "Cancelli lignæ, aut ferreæ crates sunt inter se modicis inter-

secretary, because these, for the preserving of their writings and notes of remembrance, were wont to sit and write *intra cancellos*, that is, within certain places inclosing them, made in the manner of chequer-work: but from hence in time it came to be used for any one that is employed for the giving of answer unto suitors, for keeping of records and notes of remembrance, and generally for the performance of some principal duties pertaining to him whose chancellor he is said to be.

CHAPTER XXX.

OF THE FORM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND
THE INSTITUTION AND AUTHORITY OF METROPOLITANS
AND PATRIARCHS.

THIS being the form of government of each diocese and particular Church, let us consider what dependence or subordination such particular Churches have. For it cannot nor may not be imagined, that each diocese or particular Church is absolutely supreme, and subject to no higher authority. The papists are of opinion that Christ constituted and appointed one chief pastor, with universality of power, as his vicegerent-general upon earth, placed him in the chief city of the world, and set him over all the other bishops and Churches. But the ancient fathers are of another opinion. For Hierome¹ pronounceth that all bishops are equal in order, office, and ministry, whether of Rome, Eugubium, Tanais, or Constantinople; howsoever riches and magnificence of Churches and cities, may make one seem to be greater than another: and Cyprian speaketh to the same purpose, saying: "Let no bishop make himself a judge of other, every one having re-

vallis in quincuncem positæ, quibus quum aër adspectusque admittatur prohibetur accessus. His scenæ, fenestræ, judicum tribunalia, scribarumque subsellia, (a quibus *cancellarii* dicti), muniri solent."—Onuphr. Panvin. Interpr. Voc. Eccles. [Ad calc. Platinæ Vitt. Pontiff. p. 64. Colon. Ubior. 1600.]

¹ "Ubique fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii."—Hieron. ad Evagrium. [Sive Evangelum. Epist. cxlvii. Tom. i. col. 1080.]

ceived his authority from Christ, and therefore being accountant to him only¹." And this he speaketh upon occasion of a difference between him and the Roman bishops of that time, about rebaptization.

Wherefore let us examine these contrary opinions, and see which of them is most agreeable unto truth and reason. For the confirmation of the former of these two opinions, the Romanists allege many things, to prove that the best form of regiment and government is a monarchy, and consequently that Christ, who undoubtedly established the best form, appointed one supreme monarch in his Church. To this allegation Ockam² most excellently and learnedly answereth in his *Dialogues*, showing and proving at large, that though the government of one, or a monarchy, be the best form of regiment in one city or country, as Aristotle rightly teacheth, yet it is not the best form of policy and government in respect of the whole world and all the parts of it, so far distant and remote one from another; because the whole world, and the infinite different countries and regions of it, regularly may be better governed by many, whereof no one is superior to other, than by one alone: neither is the same form of government always most expedient for the whole, and for each part; for greater circuits, and for straiter or narrower bounds: seeing one man may sustain the burthen of hearing, determining, and despatching

¹ "Nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, cum habeat in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus."—Cyprian. Lib. ii. Epist. i. [Al. Epist. lxxii. p. 198.]

"Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit: quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium; tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi."—Id. in Concil. Carthag. [p. 229.]

² "Minus malum est ut populus partialis et parvus inficiatur ab uno episcopo, quam ut totus vel fere totus populus Christianus inficiatur ab uno capite, quod omnibus præsit . . . Quamvis regnum sit optima politia in una civitate secundum Aristotelem, qui solummodo loquitur de politiis quæ in civitatibus custodiuntur, ut in verbis ejus quam pluribus in lib. politicorum colligitur; tamen regnum non est optima politia in toto orbe, nec in omni parte orbis."—Ockam, Dialog. Part. iii. Tract. 1. Lib. ii. cap. 30. [Apud Goldast. Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp. Tom. ii. p. 819, Francof. 1614.]

the greater causes and more important matters in one kingdom or country ; but no one can so manage the weightiest businesses of the whole world. And that in like sort, though it be expedient that there should be one bishop over some part of the Church and people of God, yet there is not the same reason that there should be one over the whole, seeing no one can despatch the greater businesses, and manage the weightier affairs of the whole Christian world. “Besides,” he saith, “it would be most dangerous that there should be any such one supreme ruler of the whole Church ; for that, if he should fall into error or heresy, all the whole world would be in great danger to be seduced ; the members, for the most part, conforming themselves to their head, and the inferiors to their rulers and superiors.” That which Ockam saith may be confirmed by the authority of St Augustine, who thinketh a monarchy, or the government of one supreme ruler, most fit for the several countries and parts of the world, but not for the whole. His words are: *Feliciores essent res humanæ, si omnia regna essent parva, et concordî vicinitate lætantiâ*¹; that is, “The state of worldly things would be much more happy, if the whole world were divided out into small kingdoms, joyfully conspiring together in a friendly neighbourhood, than if all should be swayed by one supreme commander.”

Thus then we deny not, but that amongst all the simple and single forms of government a monarchy is the best for each country and people ; neither doth Calvin contradict us herein, as Bellarmine² seemeth to report ; for he doth not simply say³, that amongst all the simple forms of government

¹ August. De Civ. Dei, Lib. iv. cap. 15. [Tom. vii. col. 99.]

² “Joannes quidem Calvinus ut omnes omnino vias obstruat quibus ad ecclesiasticam monarchiam constituendam disputando perveniri solet, aristocratiam ex formis simplicibus, ex mixtis vero temperatum regimen ex ipsa et democratia omnibus aliis anteponit: deterrimam omnium vult esse monarchiam, præsertim si in toto orbe terrarum in ecclesia universa constituatur.”—Bellarm. De Rom. Pont. Lib. i. cap. 1. [Tom. i. p. 251.]

³ “Equidem si in se considerentur tres illæ quas ponunt philosophi regiminis formæ, minime negaverim vel aristocratiam vel temperatum ex ipsa et politia statum aliis longe excellere, non id quidem per se, sed quia rarissime contingit reges sibi moderari, ut nunquam a justo et recto discrepet eorum voluntas.”—Calvin. Instit. Lib. iv. cap. 20. § 8. [fol. 306, Gen. 1617.]

aristocracy is best and to be preferred, but only in the respect of often declinings and swervings of absolute kings, hardly moderating themselves so in so free and absolute a liberty of commanding all, as that their will should never swerve from that which is right and good. But Bellarmine¹ himself thinketh that the mixed forms of government are to be preferred before any of those simple forms of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, as having in them the best that is found in every of those single and simple forms. And such is the government of the Church of God, Christ undoubtedly establishing the best form of government in the same. For the government of each diocese, and particular Church, resteth principally in one, who hath an eminent and peerless power, without whom nothing may be attempted or done: yet are there others joined with him as assistants², without whose counsel, advice, and consent, he may do nothing of moment and consequence; whom he cannot at his pleasure displace and remove from their standings, or deprive them of their honour, or any way hardly censure them of himself alone; but in the case of a deacon³, he must have two other bishops to concur with him, and in the case of a presbyter, five, without which concurrence he may not proceed against either of them. The government of a province is principally aristocratical, resting in the bishops of the province and their assistants, but it hath a kind of chieftly of one having a primacy of order and honour amongst the rest, who being placed in the metropolis or mother-city, is named a metropolitan. This government is so mixed, that the bishops may do nothing concerning the state of the whole province, or out of the limits

¹ "Regimen temperatum ex omnibus tribus formis propter naturæ humanæ corruptionem utilius est, quam simplex monarchia."—Bellarm. De Rom. Pont. Lib. i. cap. 3. [p. 255.]

² "Ut episcopus sine consilio clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet, ita ut civium conniventium et testimonium quærat.

"Ut episcopus nullius causam audiat absque præsentia clericorum suorum; alioquin irrita erit sententia episcopi, nisi clericorum præsentia confirmetur."—Concil. Carthag. iv. [Can. 22, 23. Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 1439.]

³ "Si autem presbyteri vel diaconi fuerint accusati, adjuncto sibi ex vicinis locis legitimo numero collegarum, id est, in presbyteri nomine quinque, in diaconi duobus, episcopi ipsorum causas discutiant."—Concil. Carthag. iii. [Can. 8. Tom. ii. col. 1401.]

of their own Churches, without consulting the bishop of the mother-city, nor he without them¹; and if they differ in judgment and opinion, he is bound to follow the major part of voices, for the ending and determining of all controversies that may or do arise concerning matters of faith or of fact². Neither is this the form of government of one province only, but the government of larger circuits is altogether like unto it, and in proportion the same. For look what the metropolitan is in respect of the bishops of the province, that and no more is the primate or patriarch in respect of the metropolitans and bishops of divers provinces; so that as the metropolitan can do nothing out of his own diocese without the concurrence of the major part of the bishops of the province, though he be in order and honour the first and greatest amongst them, who must be consulted before they can do any thing; so in like sort, the primate or patriarch may do nothing without the advice and consent of the metropolitans and bishops subject unto him. So that we see the form of church-government is mixed in such sort, that, in respect of a diocese or particular Church, there is a special authority resting in one, though not excluding nor neglecting the assistance and concurrence of more; but the government of

¹ “Si quis metropolitanus episcopus, nisi quod solummodo ad propriam pertinet parochiam, sine consilio et voluntate omnium com-provincialium episcoporum, extra aliquid agere tentaverit, gradus sui periculo subiacebit, et quod egerit irritum habeatur et vacuum.... Similiter ipsi comprovinciales episcopi cuncta cum ejus consilio, nisi quantum ad proprias pertinet parochias agant, juxta sanctorum constituta patrum.”—Lucius Papa in Epist. ad Episc. Gall. et Hispan. [Apud Labbe, Concil. Tom. i. col. 741.]

“Τοὺς καθ’ ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς πράγματα ἔχοντας, ὅθεν ἔδοξε καὶ τῇ τιμῇ προηγείσθαι αὐτὸν, μηδὲν τε πράττειν περιττὸν τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐπισκόπους ἄνευ αὐτοῦ. . . . περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτὸν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης.”—Concil. Antioch. i. can. 9. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 589.]

“Ἐπίσκοπον προσήκει μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι. . . . τὸ δὲ κῦρος τῶν γινομένων δίδοσθαι καθ’ ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ.”—Concil. Nicæen. can. 4. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 34.]

² “Εἰ δὲ κατὰ τὸν ὀρισμένον κανόνα γίγνοιτο ἡ κατάστασις, ἀντιλέγοιεν δέ τινες δι’ οἰκείαν φιλονεικίαν, κρατεῖν τὴν τῶν πλειόνων ψῆφον.”—Concil. Antioch. i. can. 19. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 593.]

many particular Churches and provinces is principally aristocratical; all things being swayed by the major part of the voices of the bishops and metropolitans, yet admitting a primacy of order and honour of one amongst the rest, who must be first consulted, from whom all deliberations must take beginning, and who sitteth in all their meetings as a president and moderator.

This Bellarmine¹ endeavoureth to improve, and therefore laboureth to show that the supreme power of the Church is not in the company of bishops. His first reason is, because Christ, as he supposeth, gave no authority to his apostles and disciples, but that which he gave to every one of them apart, as to preach, baptize, bind and loose, remit and retain sin. But this silly argument is easily answered, and the absurdity of Bellarmine's confident affirmation is too apparent. For to ordain bishops, to depose bishops or presbyters, and to determine the differences and controversies that arise amongst them, is, as I think, a great part of ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction: yet may no one bishop do any of these things, but the company of bishops only². To the ordination of a bishop, the presence of the metropolitan, and of three other bishops at the least, with the consent of the rest that are absent, signified in writing, is by the old canons required; neither did the Church ever admit less than three bishops to ordain, unless in certain cases of necessity: and touching the depriving or degrading of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, the ancient canon requireth the concurrence and consent of three bishops for the censuring and depriving of a deacon; of six for the depriving of a presbyter; and of twelve for the

¹ "Nusquam in scripturis legitur collata summa potestas concilio sacerdotum: quaecunque enim auctoritas apostolis cæterisque discipulis concessa a Christo est non solum omnibus sed etiam singulis concessa est; neque ad eam exercendam erat opus concilio: poterant enim sine dubio apostoli singuli et possunt etiam nunc singuli episcopi docere, baptizare, solvere, ligare, ordinare ministros."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. I. cap. 8. [Tom. I. p. 260.]

² "Placet omnibus, ut inconsulto primate cujuslibet provinciae tam facile nemo præsumat, licet cum multis episcopis, in quocunque loco sine ejus (ut dictum est) præcepto episcopum ordinare. Si autem necessitas fuerit, tres episcopi, in quocunque loco sint, cum primatis præcepto ordinare debeant episcopum."—Concil. Carthag. II. Can. 12. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1394.]

censuring, judging, and deposing of a bishop. Wherefore let us see if the cardinal have any better reason behind.

His second reason is, that it cannot be imagined that Christ committed the government of the Church to the company of bishops; for that then the Church should oftentimes lack governors, for that the bishops are seldom assembled by joint consent to decree and determine things. Surely this reason hath far less strength than the former: for in the beginning all the bishops of each province met to the ordination of every bishop newly elected, and twice in the year besides there was a synod holden, consisting of all the bishops of the province, the metropolitan not only having power, but also being straitly bound to convocate his brethren, and they as surely tied and obliged to come when he called them.

His third reason which he bringeth to prove that the government of the Church was not by Christ committed to the company of bishops, but to some one chief and supreme amongst them, is, for that the whole multitude of right believing Christians is one Church, and therefore must have one chief ruler. For answer hereunto we say, that a Church may be named one, either in respect of the same faith, hope, profession, means of salvation, and communion or fellowship of saints; and so the whole multitude of right believers throughout the world is but one Church: or in respect of the same immediate communicating together in sacraments, and in the actions and exercises of God's worship and service. The unity of the Church of God in this latter sort implieth and requireth a necessity of the unity of one chief pastor, but the unity of the Church in the former sort may stand without the unity of one pastor. "Christian men," saith Ockam¹, "in scripture are compared to sheep, and the Church of God to a fold. Now though it be expedient that these sheep, so many as belong to the same particular fold, that go out to the same pastures to feed, to the same rivers of water to drink, and do remain and abide together, should be fed, directed, and guided by the same pastor; yet the sheep of divers folds led

¹ "Expedit uni ovili in quo oves simul morantur regi et pasci ab uno pastore mortali. Uni tamen ovili in quo omnes oves non simul morantur sufficit ut regantur a principe pastorum, scilicet Christo."—Gul. De Ockam. Dialog. Part. III. Tract. 1. Lib. II. cap. 30. [Tom. II. p. 818. Goldast. Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp. Francof. 1614.]

out to divers pastures to feed in, and rivers of water to drink, may have their diversity of pastors under the same chief Shepherd Christ Jesus: neither is there any unity implied in the whole Church, or in the Churches of divers provinces, which may not be preserved, as well by the multitude and diversity of pastors, bound and knit together in the bond of conspiring consent and agreement, as by the unity of one chief pastor." And in this sort we shall find the Church of God to have stood in perfect unity in the first and best ages thereof, without finding any want of the help of one chief pastor: for how could there be a more perfect unity in the whole Church, than when the pastor of each particular Church, chosen by the clergy and people of the same, was appointed by the metropolitan and all the rest of the bishops of the province, for his sincerity in profession, and godliness of conversation, and ordained to the work of the ministry by the joint imposition of all their hands? when the metropolitans of several provinces were confirmed by the primate or patriarch, but ordained by the bishops of their provinces¹? when the patriarchs² elected by the clergy and people, and ordained by their metropolitans, sent their synodal letters one to another, testifying and expressing their faith and profession, before they were received and allowed one of another, and before they were accounted and reputed for lawful patriarchs³?

Wherefore presupposing that the government of the Church is not monarchical in respect of any one supreme pastor on earth, but mixed; and having seen how, notwithstanding the diversity of many pastors, the Church may be

¹ "Placuit ut quisquis metropolitanus infra tres menses consecrationis suæ ad fidem suam exponendam, palliumque suscipiendum ad apostolicam sedem non miserit, commissa sibi careat dignitate; sitque licentia metropolitanis aliis, post secundam et tertiam commonitionem viduatis ecclesiis cum consilio Romani pontificis ordinando episcopos subvenire."—Decret. Damasi, ex Decret. Ivonis Carnotensis, Lib. i. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 1034.]

² Vide Greg. Lib. i. Epist. xxiv. [Al. xxv. Tom. ii. col. 507, sq.]

³ "Ἀρχαία τις, τὰληθὲς δὲ φράσαι, ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις διῆκε, τοὺς πρὸς ἱεραρχίαν ἀγομένους τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν τὰς ἱεραρχίας ἐγχειρίζουσιν ὡς αὐτοὶ τὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτῶν ἀνατίθεται."—Exemplar litterarum Tharasii ad summos sacerdotes et episcopos Antiochiæ, Alexandriæ, et Sanctæ Urbis. in 3 Act. Synod. vii. [Labbe, Tom. viii. col. 810.]

preserved in peace and unity, let us more exactly and distinctly consider what the ancient form of church policy and government was.

If we look into the monuments of antiquity, we shall find that there were anciently three subordinations in the Church. For the actions of the bishop of each particular Church of a city, and places adjoining, were subject to the censure and judgment of the rest of the bishops of the same province; amongst whom for order sake there was one chief, to whom it pertained to call them together, to sit as moderator in the midst of them being assembled, and to execute what by joint consent they resolved on: the actions of the bishops of a province, and a provincial synod consisting of those bishops, were subject to a synod consisting of the metropolitans and other bishops of divers provinces. This synod was of two sorts. For either it consisted of the metropolitans and bishops of one kingdom and nation only, as did the councils of Africa; or of the metropolitans and bishops of many kingdoms. If of the metropolitans and bishops of one kingdom and state only, the chief primate was moderator; if of many, one of the patriarchs, and chief bishops of the whole world, every Church being subordinate to some one of the patriarchal Churches, and incorporate into the unity of it. Thirdly, the actions of the bishops of a whole kingdom and patriarchship were subject to an œcumenical synod, consisting of all the patriarchs, and the metropolitans and the bishops subject to them.

Touching provincial councils, to the censures whereof the actions of particular Churches are subject, they were by the ancient canons of the Church to be holden in every province twice every year. "It is very necessary¹," say the fathers of the council of Nice, "that there should be a synod twice every year in every province; that all the bishops of the province meeting together, may in common think upon those things that are doubtful and questionable; for the despatch of ecclesiastical businesses, and the determining of matters in controversy." "We think it were fit²," say the fathers in

¹ "Καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξεν ἐκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν δις τοῦ ἔτους συνόδους γίνεσθαι· ἵνα κοινῇ πάντων τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομένων τὰ τοιαῦτα ζητήματα ἐξετάζοιτο."—Concil. Nicæn. Can. v. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 36.]

² "Διὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς χρείας, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων δια-

the council of Antioch, "that in every province synods of bishops should be assembled twice every year." The first council of Constantinople¹ decreeth the same: and the fathers assembled in the council of Chalcedon² complain that in some provinces the synods of bishops are not holden, and that thereby many ecclesiastical matters needing reformation are neglected: and therefore they appoint, "that the bishops of every province shall assemble every year twice at that place which the bishop of the mother-city shall think fit, to amend all things that shall be found to be amiss in the province." Here we see the necessity of holding these synods, and by whom they were to be called and moderated. Wherefore let us now proceed to see of whom they consisted, what causes they examined and determined, what the power of the metropolitan originally was, and what in process of time, by positive constitution, upon due and just considerations, it grew to be.

Touching the persons that provincial synods consisted of, it is clear and evident, that not only bishops, but presbyters also, were present in these assemblies, and had decisive voices: whereupon the council of Antisiodorum saith: "Let all the presbyters being called come to the synod in the city³." The council of Tarracon: "Let letters be sent by the metropolitan to his brethren, that they bring with them to the synod, not only some of the presbyters of the cathedral church, but also of each diocese⁴." And the fourth council of Toledo, describ-

λύσεις, καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξε συνόδους καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων γίνεσθαι δεύτερον τοῦ ἔτους."—Concil. Antioch. Can. xx. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 593.]

¹ "Εὐδηλον ὡς τὰ καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἢ τῆς ἐπαρχίας σύνοδος διοικήσει, κατὰ τὰ ἐν Νικαίᾳ ὠρισμένα."—Concil. Constantinop. Can. II. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1126.]

² "Ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς ἡμετέρας ἀκοὰς, ὡς ἐν ταῖς ἐπαρχίαις αἱ κεκανονισμέναι σύνοδοι τῶν ἐπισκόπων οὐ γίνονται, καὶ ἐκ τούτου πολλὰ παραμελείται τῶν διορθώσεως δεομένων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων. Ὁρίσε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος κατὰ τοὺς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων κανόνας δις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συντρέχειν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, ἔνθα ἂν ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος δοκιμάσῃ, καὶ διορθοῦν ἕκαστα τὰ ἀνακύπτοντα."—Concil. Chalced. Can. XIX. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1689.]

³ "Ut medio Maio omnes presbyteri ad synodum in civitatem veniant, et Kalendis Novembris omnes abbates ad concilium conveniant."—Concil. Antisiod. Can. VII. [Labbe, Tom. VI. col. 643.]

⁴ "Epistolæ tales per fratres a metropolitano sunt dirigendæ, ut non solum a cathedralibus ecclesiis presbyteri, verum etiam de diœ-

ing the form of celebrating provincial synods, hath these words: "Let the bishops assembled go to the church, and sit according to the time of their ordination; and after all the bishops are entered and set, let the presbyters be called, and the bishops sitting in compass, let presbyters sit behind them, and the deacons stand before them¹." In the first council of Toledo we find these words: *Consedentibus presbyteris, astantibus diaconis, et cæteris qui intererant concilio congregato, Patronus episcopus dixit, &c.*²; that is, "The presbyters sitting together with the bishops, the deacons standing before them, and the rest, which were present in the council assembled, Patronus the bishop said," &c. The like we read of a synod holden by Gregory the pope. The words are these: *Gregorius papa coram sacratissimo corpore beati Petri apostoli, cum episcopis omnibus Romanæ Ecclesiæ, et presbyteris residens, assistantibus diaconis, et cuncto clero, dixit, &c.*³; that is, "Gregory the pope sitting before the most sacred body of blessed Peter, with all the bishops of the Roman Church and the presbyters also, the deacons standing before them, and all the clergy, said," &c. And that presbyters were not only present in provincial synods, but had decisive voices as well as bishops, it appeareth by their subscribing to the decrees of such synods⁴, in the very same form and manner that bishops did. So that it will be found most false and untrue that Bellarmine⁵ hath, that presbyters have

cesanis ad concilium trahant, et aliquos de filiis ecclesiæ secularibus secum adducere debeant."—Concil. Tarracon. Can. XIII. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 700.]

¹ "Post ingressum omnium episcoporum atque concessum, vocentur deinde presbyteri quos causa probaverit introire. Nullus se inter hos ingerat diaconorum. Post hos ingrediantur diaconi probabiles, quos ordo poposcerit interesse: et corona facta de sedibus episcoporum, presbyteri a tergo eorum resideant. Diacones in conspectu episcoporum stent."—Concil. Tolet. iv. Can. 4. [Labbe, Tom. vi. col. 1451.]

² Concil. Tolet. i. Initio. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 1470.]

³ Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. cap. 88. [Al. Append. Ep. v. Tom. ii. col. 1288.]

⁴ Vide Subscript. Concil. Eliberitan. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 991] et Synod. sub Gregorio [ut supra.]

⁵ "Omnia concilia, tum generalia, tum provincialia, etiam antiquissima, a solis episcopis celebrata sunt."—Bellarm. De Clericis, Lib. i. cap. 14. [Tom. ii. p. 133.]

no voices in synods: and the ancient form of our convocation here in England, wherein not only the archbishops and bishops, but sundry presbyters also, as well out of cathedral-churches as dioceses at large, are present and have decisive voices, will clearly refute the same.

The causes that were wont to be examined and determined in the meeting of the bishops of the province, were the ordinations of bishops¹, when any churches were void, and the depriving and rejecting of all such as were found unworthy of their honour and place; and in a word, any complaint of wrong done in any church was there to be heard. "Let the provincial synods be holden twice every year," saith the council of Antioch², "and let the presbyters and deacons be present; and as many as think they have been any way hurt or wronged, there expect the determination of the synod." The power of the metropolitan was in calling the rest of the bishops to the synod, in appointing the place of their meeting, and in sitting as president in the midst of them: and so were things moderated, that neither the rest might proceed to do anything without consulting him, nor he to do anything without them, but was tied in all matters of difference to follow the major part³; and if he neglected his duty in convocating his brethren, that so things might be determined by common consent, he was by the canons subject to censure and punishment. Thus at first all matters were to be determined, heard, and ended by synods, and they holden twice every year; but in process of time, when the governors of the Church could not conveniently assemble in synod twice a year, the fathers of the sixth general council⁴ decreed, that yet in any case there should be a

¹ "Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι δίχα συνόδου, καὶ παρουσίας τοῦ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει τῆς ἐπαρχίας."—Concil. Antioch. Can. XIX. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 593.]

² "Διὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς χρείας, καὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων διαλύσεις καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξε συνόδους καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων γίνεσθαι δεύτερον τοῦ ἔτους, . . . ὥστε ἐν αὐταῖς ταύταις ταῖς συνόδοις προσιέναι πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἡδικῆσθαι νομιζόντας, καὶ παρὰ τῆς συνόδου ἐπικρίσεως τυγχάνειν. Μὴ ἐξεῖναι δέ τινας καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ποιεῖσθαι ἄνευ τῶν πεπιστευμένων τὰς μητροπόλεις."—Can. XX. [Ibid.]

³ "Περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτὸν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης."—Can. IX. [col. 589.]

⁴ "Ἐδοξεν ὥστε τρόπῳ παντὶ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τὴν τῶν προγεγραμμένων ἐπισκόπων διὰ τὰ ὡς εἰκὸς ἀναφυόμενα ἐκκλησιαστικὰ κεφάλαια ἐν ἐκάστη

synod of bishops once every year for ecclesiastical questions. Likewise the seventh general council decreeth in this sort: "Whereas the canon willeth judicial inquisition to be made twice every year by the assembly of bishops in every province, and yet, for the misery and poverty of such as should travel to synods, the fathers of the sixth council decreed, it should be once in the year, and then things amiss to be redressed, we renew this later canon¹." So that, whereas at the first there was a synod of bishops in every province twice in the year, now it was sufficient if the bishops met once. But afterwards, many things falling out to hinder their happy meetings, we shall find that they met not so often, and therefore the council of Basil² appointeth episcopal synods to be holden once every year, and provincial at the least once in three years. And so in time causes growing many, and the difficulties intolerable in coming together, and in staying to hear these causes thus multiplied and increased, it was thought fitter to refer the hearing of complaints and appeals to metropolitans, and such like ecclesiastical judges, limited and directed by canons and imperial laws, than to trouble the pastors of whole provinces, and to wrong the people by the absence of their pastors and guides.

Thus having spoken of the authority of the metropolitan and his council in every province, it remaineth that we come to synods of a larger extent. These, besides œcumenical, whereof we will not yet speak, were of two sorts: patriarchal,

ἐπαρχία γίνεσθαι σύνοδον."—Concil. Sext. [Al. Quinisext. in Trullo.] Can. viii. [Labbe, Tom. vii. col. 1349.]

¹ "Ἐπειδήπερ κανὼν ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων· δις τοῦ ἔτους καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν χρή γίνεσθαι διὰ συναθροίσεως ἐπισκόπων τὰς κανονικάς ζητήσεις, διὰ γοῦν τὴν συντριβὴν καὶ τὸ ἐνδεῶς ἔχειν πρὸς ὁδοιπορίαν τοῦς συναθροιζομένους, ὥρισαν οἱ τῆς ἔκτης συνόδου ὅσιοι πατέρες ἐξ ἅπαντος τρόπου καὶ προφάσεως ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ γίνεσθαι, καὶ τὰ ἐσφαλμένα διορθοῦσθαι· τοῦτον οὖν τὸν κανόνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνανεοῦμεν."—Concil. Nicæn. ii. Can. vi. [Labbe, Tom. viii. col. 1252.]

² "Sancta synodus statuit atque præcipit synodum episcopalem in qualibet diœcesi post octavas dominicæ resurrectionis vel alia die secundum consuetudinem diœcesum, ad minus semel in anno, ubi non est consuetudo bis, annatim celebrari. Celebretur quoque in singulis provinciis saltem infra biennium a fine concilii generalis et deinde ad minus semel de triennio in triennium provinciale concilium in loco tuto."—Concil. Basil. [Sess. xv. Labbe, Tom. xvii. col. 288.]

wherein one of the patriarchs and chief bishops of the world sat as president; or national, consisting of the bishops of many provinces within one country or kingdom, wherein the primate sat as president: of which sort the councils of Africa were: concerning which councils it is ordered in the third council of Carthage¹, that once every year there shall be a general assembly of the bishops of Africa, to which all the provinces which have *primas sedes*, that is, first sees, and so may hold provincial councils, shall out of their councils send two bishops, or as many as they shall think fit; but that out of Tripolis, because of the poverty of the bishops of it, one bishop shall come. In these councils the legates of the bishop of Rome were sometimes present, not as presidents but assistants, as other metropolitans were. There were many provinces which had *primas sedes*, that is, first sees, and so consequently many primates; yet for distinction, some call him that was bishop of that first see (which was in honour before all the rest of the same country and kingdom, and to whom in all common deliberations the other metropolitans did resort) by an excellency the primate, and the rest by the common name of metropolitans; in which sense the bishop of Carthage was primate of all Africa: and so is a primate in order and honour before metropolitans, but inferior unto a patriarch. Of this distinction of degrees of honour amongst metropolitans and chief bishops, Hugo de Sancto Victore writeth in this sort: *Post sacerdotes altiores sunt principes sacerdotum, id est, episcopi: supra quos iterum sunt archiepiscopi: et supra illos qui dicuntur primates: supra quos quidam patriarchas constituere volunt; alii eosdem patriarchas et primates dicunt*²: that is, "After priests we are to reckon the chief priests, that is, bishops, as in the first degree and honour above them: above whom again are archbishops, and above them they that are

¹ "Placuit ut propter causas ecclesiasticas quæ ad perniciem plebium sæpe veterascunt singulis quibusque annis concilium convocetur. Ad quod omnes provinciæ quæ primas sedes habent de conciliis suis ternos legatos mittant, ut et minus invidiosi minusque hospitibus sumptuosi conventus plena possit esse auctoritas. De Tripoli autem propter inopiam episcoporum unus episcopus veniat."—Concil. Carthag. III. Can. 2. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1399.]

² Hugo de Sancto Victore, De Sacram. Fid. Lib. II. Part. 3. cap. 5. [Tom. III. p. 445, Mogunt. 1617.]

named primates :” above whom some will have patriarchs to be placed, but others will have patriarchs and primates to be all one. Rabanus¹, in his book *De Institutione Clericorum*, sorteth bishops into three ranks : patriarchs, archbishops, who also are named metropolitans, and ordinary bishops.

CHAPTER XXXI.

OF PATRIARCHS, WHO THEY WERE, AND THE REASON WHY THEY WERE PREFERRED BEFORE OTHER BISHOPS.

TOUCHING the patriarchs, they were in the beginning but only three ; to wit, the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The reason, as some think, why the bishops of these places were preferred before other and made patriarchs, was in respect had to blessed Peter, who was in sort before expressed in order and honour the first and chiefest of the apostles. For Antioch was honoured for that he sat there for a certain space, and afterwards governed it by Evodius : Alexandria, for that he placed Mark his scholar there : and Rome, because it was the place of his death and martyrdom ; where in his body he stayeth and expecteth the resurrection of the dead, and the second coming of Christ. All the Churches founded by any apostle are rightly called apostolic, but these more specially in which the apostle Peter sat. *Secunda sedes, saith Anacletus, apud Alexandriam beati Petri nomine a Marco ejus discipulo consecrata est. Tertia autem sedes apud Antiochiam ejusdem beati Petri apostoli habetur honorabilis*² : that is, “ The second see, and in degree and honour next unto that of Rome, was consecrated at Alexandria, by the authority of blessed Peter, by Mark his scholar ; and the third see honourable for Peter’s presence in the same is at Antioch.” *Nihil, saith Leo writing to Anatolius, Alexandriae sedi, ejus quam per Sanctum Marcum evangelistam beati Petri discipulum meruit, pereat dignitatis.*

¹ “Ordo episcoporum tripartitus est, id est, in patriarchis, archiepiscopis qui et metropolitani sunt, et episcopis.”—Raban. De Instit. Cler. Lib. i. cap. 5. [Tom. vi. p. 4. Colon. Agripp. 1624.]

² Anaclet. Pap. Epist. iii. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 530.]

*Antiochena quoque ecclesia in qua primum prædicante apostolo Petro, Christianum nomen exortum est, in paternæ constitutionis ordine perseveret; et in gradu tertio collocata, nunquam se fiat inferior*¹: that is, "Let the see of Alexandria lose no part of that dignity which it obtained by St Mark the evangelist, the disciple of blessed Peter. Let the Church of Antioch also, in which upon Peter's preaching the name of Christians first began, continue in that degree and order wherein the constitution of the fathers set it, and being placed in the third degree, let it never be put lower." This did Leo write, when the bishop of Constantinople sought to have the second place in the Church of God, and to be preferred before the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. Gregory writeth to the same effect to Eulogius, bishop of Alexandria. His words are: *Cum multi sint apostoli, pro ipso tamen principatu sola apostolorum principis sedes in autoritate convaluit, quæ tribus in locis unius est. Ipse enim sublimavit sedem, in qua etiam quiescere et præsentem vitam finire dignatus est. Ipse decoravit sedem in qua evangelistam discipulum misit. Ipse firmavit sedem, in qua septem annis quamvis discessurus sedit. Cum ergo unius atque una sit sedes, cui ex autoritate divina tres nunc episcopi præcident, quicquid ego de vobis boni audio, mihi imputo*²: that is, "Whereas there were many apostles, yet in respect of the chieftly that Peter had, as being prince of the apostles, his see only grew to be in chief authority, which in three places is yet the see but of one and the same apostle. For he exalted that see in which he pleased to rest, and end this present life; he beautified that see in which he placed Mark his scholar; and he firmly and strongly settled that see in which he sat seven years, though with purpose in the end to leave it. Whereas therefore there is one see of one apostle, in which by divine authority three sit as presidents, whatsoever good I hear of you, I impute it to myself." And again in the same place to Eulogius, having spoken to him of the dignity of Peter's chair, in which he sat, he saith: "He hath spoken to me of Peter's chair, who himself sitteth on Peter's chair." This is the opinion of these Roman bishops touching the reason of the

¹ Leo I. Pap. ad Anatol. Epist. liii. [Al. cvi. Tom. i. col. 1167.]

² Greg. Lib. vi. Epist. xxxvii. [Al. Lib. vii. Epist. xl. Tom. ii. col. 888.]

exaltation of the sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, above other episcopal sees; who, how partially soever they may be thought to be affected to the chair of Peter, yet herein do they mainly cross the conceit of the Romanists at this day, in that they teach that other bishops succeed Peter in the chair, and that chiefly and primacy he had, as well as the bishop of Rome.

The dignity of these apostolical Churches was confirmed in the Nicene council, and each of them confined within the ancient bounds and limits thereof. "Let the ancient customs," say the Nicene fathers, "continue in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria may have power over all these; seeing the bishop of Rome hath the like custom. In like sort in Antioch, and other provinces, let every Church retain and keep her own degree and honour¹." Bellarmine² much troubleth himself about this limitation and bounding of these patriarchs, as prejudicial to the illimited jurisdiction of the Roman bishop; and therefore though it be most clear that there was a particular assignation of Churches to every of these patriarchs, yet he seeketh to avoid the evidence of these words. For whereas Ruffinus saith, it was

¹ "Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνήθες ἐστίν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις."—Concil. Nicæn. Can. vi. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 36.]

² "Primo, exponit Ruffinus, Lib. x. Hist. Eccles. cap. 6, decretum esse a concilio, ut Alexandrinus episcopus habeat curam Ægypti, sicut habet episcopus Romanus curam suburbanarum ecclesiarum.

"At falsa expositio est; nam si episcopus Romanus est primus et præcipuus patriarcha, quomodo credibile est illi assignatam angustissimam regionem, aliis autem patriarchis minoribus latissimam.

"Secunda expositio est Theodori Balsamonis in explic. hor. can. et Nili in suo libro contr. Prim., consilium decrevisse, ut episcopus Alexandrinus habeat curam totius Ægypti sicut Romanus episcopus habet curam totius Occidentis. Hæc quidem sententia liberalior est, sed tamen falsa.

"Sunt autem circa hunc canonem aliqua notanda. Primo ex Nicolao I. in Epist. ad Michael. concilium Nicænum nihil statuisset circa Romanam ecclesiam; quoniam potestas ejus non ab hominibus, sed a Deo est; sed tantum ex forma Romanæ ecclesiæ constituisse statum aliarum ecclesiarum."—Bellarm. De Pontif. Rom. Lib. ii. cap. 13. [Tom. i. p. 314.]

decreed by the council of Nice, that the bishop of Alexandria should have care and charge over Egypt, as the bishop of Rome hath of the Churches near that city; and Theodorus Balsamon, in the explication of the Nicene canons, with Nilus, in his book against the primacy, interpreteth the words of the Nicene decree in this sense, that the bishop of Alexandria should have the charge of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, and the confirming of the metropolitans in those parts, because the bishop of Rome, who hath a care of the West, confirmeth the metropolitans of the West; he maketh this construction of the words of the council: "Let the bishop of Alexandria have the charge of Egypt, seeing the bishop of Rome was wont to permit him so to have, before any council had decreed it. And so," he saith, "Nicholas the pope, in his Epistle to Michael the emperor, understandeth the words;" which yet is most untrue: for Nicholas saith no such thing, but only that the council maketh the custom of the Roman Church the pattern for others to follow. But the eighth general council¹, which no doubt understood the words of the Nicene fathers far better than Bellarmine, sheweth plainly that the meaning of the Nicene canon was, that the bishop of Alexandria should have power over Egypt and the provinces pertaining to it, to confirm the metropolitans in the same, seeing the like custom prevaieth in the Roman Church: and this council confirmeth the same distinction of the bounds of jurisdiction, within which every patriarch is to contain himself, both for old Rome and new, and for the other Churches of Alexandria and Antioch. The canons of the Nicene council, translated out of the Arabian tongue, and published by Turrian, Pisanus, and Binnius, will fully clear this point, if our adversaries give any credit unto them. For in the eighth of those canons², the decree, about the meaning whereof we contend, is thus set down: *Constitutum est, ut episcopus Ægypti, id est, patriarcha Alexandrinus, præsideat et habeat potestatem totius Ægypti*: that is, "It is ordained that the bishop

¹ "Sancta et universalis Nicæna prima synodus antiquam consuetudinem jubet servari per Ægyptum et provincias quæ sub ipsa sunt, ita ut horum omnium Alexandrinus episcopus habeat potestatem."—*Concil. Constant. iv. can. 17.* [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 643.]

² *Apud Binium, Tom. primo Conciliorum, p. 352.* [Colon. Agripp. 1606. Labbe, Tom. II. col. 304.]

of Egypt, that is, the patriarch of Alexandria, shall sit as president, and have power over all Egypt, and over all places, cities, and towns, which are round about it: because so it is fit, and because likewise the bishop of Rome, that is the successor of Peter the apostle, hath power over all the cities and places which are about Rome. And in like sort let the bishop of Antioch have power over that whole province," &c. But because perhaps these canons, though published by themselves, as rare secrets of antiquity lately brought to light, will be of little credit with them, I will add one reason more, which to me seemeth very forcible, to confirm our interpretation of the words of the Nicene fathers. There was anciently a great contention between the Church of Rome and the Church of Constantinople about the Churches of Bulgaria¹; either of these Churches making claim thereunto, and seeking to bring them within the compass of their own jurisdiction: which contention could not have been, if the one of these two Churches had had an illimited extent of jurisdiction. But that neither of them had any such illimited jurisdiction, it is evident, in that neither Constantinople nor Rome urge any such thing for justification of their claim, but stand upon their converting of the people of Bulgaria to the Christian faith, and the planting of religion amongst them. Which either of these pretending rather than other, sought thereby to justify a title of jurisdiction and authority over them.

Wherefore resolving that we have the true meaning of the Nicene canon, let us return thither whence we have a little digressed, namely, to the discourse of patriarchical Churches and bishops set in order and honour before all other. These, as I have already showed, were at first but three, to which afterwards two other were added: first Constantinople, and afterwards Hierusalem. Touching the Church and bishop of Constantinople, after that city was by Constantine made the seat of the empire, and thereby as much or more honoured than any city in the world, the bishop thereof, before little esteemed, grew exceeding great; and in the second council, which was the first of Constantinople², was made a patriarch in degree of honour next the

¹ Binius, in Vita Hadriani II., Tom. III. Concil. Part. 2. [p. 820, sqq. Labbe, Tom. x. col. 397, sqq.]

² "Τὸν μὲν τοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς

bishop of Rome, and before the other two; and again in the council of Chalcedon¹ confirmed in the same. And though Leo resisted against this act of the council of Chalcedon, and peremptorily protested that he would not suffer the Church of Alexandria to lose the dignity of the second see, and the Church of Antioch of the third; and his successors many of them persisted in the same resistance; yet they were forced in the end to give way to the exaltation of the Constantinopolitan Church: so that after the time of Justinian the emperor, they never made any more words about this matter. Whereby we see that to be true of Hierome², *Orbis major est urbe*: that is, "The world is greater than any one city of the world, though Rome itself." The Church of Hierusalem, as being the place of Christ's passion, and whence the preaching of the gospel took beginning, was ever much honoured; yet was it not so much as a metropolitan Church at the first: but the bishop and clergy thereof were subject to the bishop of Cæsarea as their metropolitan, and the bishop of Antioch as their patriarch; as Hierome³, writing to Pammachius against John of Hierusalem, testifieth: and thereupon Leo⁴, writing to Maximus bishop of Antioch, blameth Juvenal bishop of Hierusalem for seeking to subject Palestina to himself, and chargeth him with insolent boldness for that attempt. But the fathers⁵

τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥωμην."—
Concil. Constantinop. can. 3. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1126.]

¹ "Θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ."—Concil. Chalcedon. Act. xvi. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1733.]

² Hieron. ad Evagrium. [Sive Evangelum. Epist. cxlvi. Tom. I. col. 1076.]

³ "Ni fallor hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palæstinæ metropolis Cæsarea sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia."—Id. ad Pammachium contra Johannem Hierosolymitanum, § 37. Tom. II. col. 447.]

⁴ "In Ephesina synodo, quæ impium Nestorium cum dogmate suo perculit, Juvenalis episcopus ad obtinendum Palæstinæ provinciæ principatum credidit se posse proficere; et insolentes ausus per commentitia scripta firmare."—Leo, Epist. lxii. [Al. Epist. cxix. Tom. I. col. 1215.]

⁵ "Tempore prædicti principis, Justiniani videlicet, congregata est synodus generalis apud Constantinopolim, tempore domini Vigili Papæ, Eutychii Constantinopolitani, Apollinaris Alexandrini, Pauli Antiocheni, et Eustochii Hierosolymitani patriarcharum, super tribus capitulis, &c. In qua synodo post alias populo Dei necessarias institutiones quas

of the fifth general council thought good to honour the Church of Hierusalem, where Christ suffered, and rose again from death: and therefore, whereas the bishop thereof had formerly but a bare title, and a pre-eminence in sitting before other, they made him a patriarch in order the fifth; and that he might have metropolitans subject unto him, they took some parts of the diocese of Alexandria and Antioch from the bishops of those Churches, and put them under him: so that now we have five patriarchs of the Christian Church. Touching these, the eighth general council¹ taketh order that no man shall offer any indignity to any of them. To these they were wont to wish all prosperity and long life in the conclusion of their councils. Without these, no council was holden to be full and perfect. These might convocate the metropolitans of their several divisions, and hold a patriarchal council, which was of greater authority than either those in the several provinces, or of a whole nation, formerly mentioned, because it consisted of more, and more honourable bishops: yet had the patriarchs no greater authority over the metropolitans within their larger circuits, than the metropolitans within their lesser compass. These were by the order of the eighth general council² to confirm the metropolitans subject

pro tempore promulgandas decreverat sanctorum patrum qui ad eam convenerant auctoritas, prædictam Deo amabilem Hierosolymitanam honorare ecclesiam, et ejus episcopo locum inter patriarchas dare, communi sanxit voluntate, reverentiam exhibens sanctæ resurrectioni. Et quoniam prædicta Dei cultrix civitas quasi in limite Alexandrini et Antiocheni patriarcharum erat, nec haberet unde illi urbi ordinaret suffraganeos nisi utrique patriarchæ aliquid detraheret; visum est expedire ab utroque aliquid detrahere, ut eidem juxta formam aliorum patriarchatum ordinaret subjectos. Subtraxerunt ergo Antiocheno Cæsariensem et Scythopolitanum metropolitanos, Alexandrino vero Rubensem et Berythensem item metropolitanos.”—In Fragmento Concil. v. [Constantinop. ii.] Apud Binium, Tom. ii. Concil. p. 606. [Colon. Agripp. 1606.]

¹ “Definimus neminem prorsus mundi potentium quenquam eorum qui patriarchalibus sedibus præsunt inhonorare aut movere a proprio throno tentare, sed omni reverentia et honore dignos judicare; præcipue quidem sanctissimum papam senioris Romæ, deinceps autem Constantinopoleos patriarcham, deinde vero Alexandriæ, ac Antiochiæ, atque Hierosolymorum.”—Concil. Œcumen. viii. [Constantinop. iv.] can. 21. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 646.]

² “Sancta et universalis Nicæna prima synodus antiquam consue-

unto them, either by imposition of hands, or giving the pall; but inferior bishops they might not meddle with, but were to leave them to the ordering of their metropolitans.

CHAPTER XXXII.

HOW THE POPE SUCCEEDETH PETER; WHAT OF RIGHT BELONGETH TO HIM; AND WHAT IT IS THAT HE UNJUSTLY CLAIMETH.

WE deny not but that blessed Peter had a kind of primacy of honour and order, that in respect thereof, as all metropolitans do succeed him, as being greater than other bishops in honour and place, so the patriarchs yet more specially, and amongst them the Roman bishops in the first place. We will not therefore put our adversaries to so much pains as some other have done, to prove that Peter was at Rome, that he died there, and that the bishop of Rome succeedeth him. But this is it which we say, that he succeeded him in the bishoprick of that city, and in the honour of being one of the prime bishops of the world, as the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch likewise did; but not in the condition of being universal bishop, that is, such a one in whom all episcopal power and authority is originally invested; from whom it is derived to others; and who may limit and restrain the use of it in other, as seemeth good unto himself. For Peter was not such an apostle, but had only a joint commission with the rest, who were put into it immediately by

tudinem jubet servari per Ægyptum et provincias quæ sub ipsa sunt, ita ut horum omnium Alexandrinus episcopus habeat potestatem; dicens, Quia in Romanorum civitate hujusmodi mos prævaluit, qua pro causa et hæc magna et sancta synodus tam in seniori et nova Roma, quam in sede Antiocheæ ac Hierosolymorum, priscam consuetudinem decernit in omnibus conservari, ita ut earum præsules universorum metropolitānorum qui ab ipsis promoventur, et sive per manus impositionem, sive per pallii dationem, episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant potestatem; videlicet ad convocandum eos urgente necessitate ad synodalem conventum, vel etiam ad coercendum illos et corrigendum, cum fama eos super quibusdam delictis forsitan accusaverit.—Can. 17. [col. 643.]

Christ as well as he, though he were in some sort the first man in it.

We deny not therefore to the Roman bishop his due place among the prime bishops of the world, if therewith he will rest contented; but universal bishop in sort before expressed we dare by no means admit him to be, knowing right well, that every bishop hath in his place, and keeping his own standing, power and authority immediately from Christ, which is not to be restrained or limited by any but by the company of bishops; wherein though one be chief for order sake, and to preserve unity, and in such sort that all things must take their beginning from him, yet he can do nothing without them.

The bishop of Constantinople, as I have already noted, in the time of the second general council, obtained to be one of the four patriarchs, by reason of the greatness of his Church and city; and in the fourth holden at Chalcedon, to have equal privileges with the bishop of Rome: but not contenting himself long with this equality, soon after he sought to be above him, and would be called universal bishop, seeking thereby to subject to himself all other bishops and Churches: in which proud claim he was resisted by Gregory the First¹, who professeth, that whosoever assumeth this title, overthroweth the dignity and honour of all other bishops, in his pride is like Lucifer, and may rightly be thought to be a forerunner of antichrist. "Paul the apostle," saith Gregory²,

¹ "Cum se nova præsumptione atque superbia frater meus universalem episcopum appellet, ita ut sanctæ memoriæ decessoris mei tempore adscribi se in synodo tali hoc superbo vocabulo faceret; quamvis cuncta acta illius synodi sede contradicente apostolica soluta sint; triste mihi aliquid serenissimus Dominus innuit, quod non eum corripuit qui superbit; sed magis ab intentione mea declinare studuit, qui in hac causa evangeliorum et canonum humilitatis atque rectitudinis veritatem defendo. Qua in re a prædicto fratre et consacerdote meo contra evangelicam sententiam, contra beatum quoque Petrum apostolum et contra omnes ecclesias, contraque statuta canonum agitur." —Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxiv. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xxi. Tom. ii. col. 751.]

² "Certe Paulus apostolus cum audiret quosdam dicere, 'Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego vero Cephæ,' hanc dilacerationem corporis Domini per quam membra ejus aliis quodammodo se capitibus sociabant, vehementissime perhorrescens exclamavit, dicens, 'Numquid Paulus pro vobis crucifixus est, aut in nomine Pauli baptizati estis?' Si ergo ille membra Dominici corporis certis extra Christum quasi

“when he heard certain men say, ‘I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, and I of Cephas,’ trembling, and quaking exceedingly, to hear and see this tearing and rending asunder of the Lord’s body, through which his members joined themselves in companies factiously unto other heads, cried out aloud, saying, ‘Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?’ In such sort therefore did he decline the particular subjecting of the members of the Lord’s body to certain heads, as it were, besides Christ, yea though they were the apostles themselves. And what wilt thou be able to answer to Christ the head of the universal Church in the trial of the last judgment, which goest about by assuming the title of universal bishop, to put under thyself all the members of his mystical body? Who is it, I pray thee, whom thou proposest to thyself for imitation in taking to thee so perverse a title, but he who despising the legions of angels joined with him in society as companions, sought to climb up above them to the height of singularity, that neither he might seem to be under any, nor any might be found over whom he was not: who also said, ‘I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my capitibus et ipsis quidem apostolis subjici partialiter evitavit; tu quid Christo universalis scilicet ecclesiæ capiti in extremi judicii es dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet conaris universalis appellatione supponere? Quis, rogo, in hoc tam perverso vocabulo nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui despectis angelorum legionibus secum socialiter constitutis ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut et nulli subesse, et solus omnibus præesse videretur? Qui etiam dixit, ‘In cœlum conscendam, super astra cœli exaltabo solium meum. Sedebō in monte testamenti, in lateribus aquilonis. Ascendam super altitudinem nubium, similis ero Altissimo.’

“Quid enim fratres tui omnes universalis ecclesiæ episcopi, nisi astra cœli sunt? quorum vita simul et lingua inter peccata erroresque hominum quasi inter noctis tenebras lucent. Quibus dum cupis temetipsum vocabulo elato præponere, eorumque nomen tui comparatione calcare, quid aliud dicis, nisi; ‘In cœlum conscendam, super astra cœli exaltabo solium meum’? Annon universi episcopi nubes sunt, qui et verbis prædicationis pluunt, et bonorum operum luce coruscant? Quos dum vestra fraternitas despiciens sub se premere conatur, quid aliud dicit nisi hoc, quod ab antiquo hoste dicitur, ‘Ascendam super altitudinem nubium’?

“Certe Petrus apostolus primus membrum sanctæ et universalis ecclesiæ, Paulus, Andreas, Johannes quid aliud quam singularium sunt plebium capita? et tamen sub uno capite omnes membra.”—Id. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxviii. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xviii. col. 742.]

throne above the stars of heaven, I will sit in the mountain of the testament, in the sides of the North; I will ascend above the height of the clouds, and will be like unto the Most High? For what are thy brethren, all the bishops of the universal Church, but the stars of heaven; whose life, and tongue or speech, do shine in the midst of the sins and errors of men, as it were in the midst of the darkness of the night; whose name and honour while thou seemest to trample under thy feet, in that thou seekest by this title of pride to prefer thyself before them, what else dost thou say, but, 'I will ascend into heaven, and exalt my seat above the stars of heaven?' Are not all the bishops of the Church clouds, who by the words of their preaching pour down the graces of God like showers of rain, and shine through the light of good works; whom whiles your brotherhood despising seeketh to bring under itself, what other thing doth it say but this, which is said of the old enemy, 'I will ascend above the height of the clouds?' " And a little after the same Gregory addeth: "Surely Peter the apostle was the first member of the holy and universal Church; Paul, Andrew, and John, what other thing are they but heads of particular parts of the people and Church of God? and yet notwithstanding they are all members of the Church under one head." Thus doth this holy man and worthy bishop dislike that any amongst the bishops of the Christian Church should be so proud and insolent, as to seek to be over all, and subject to none; to subject unto himself all the members of Christ, as to a head, and to challenge unto himself to be universal bishop: for that if any such be, if he fall into error or heresy he draweth all other with him, and overthroweth the state of the whole Church¹. Yet do the Roman bishops at this day take all these things unto themselves: for they subject all Christ's members to themselves, as to heads of the universal Church, upon peril of everlasting damnation; they will be subject to none, or have any to be over them; so that all depends of them, their standing is the stay of all, and their fall the ruin of all; and if they err, all err.

¹ "Si igitur illud nomen in ea ecclesia sibi quisquam arripit quod apud bonorum omnium iudicium fecit, universa ergo ecclesia, quod absit, corrui, si quando is qui appellatur universalis cadit."—Id. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxii. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xx. col. 749.]

But perhaps it will be said, that the name of universal bishop is not simply evil, nor these claims simply to be disliked; but when they are made by them to whom it pertaineth not to make them, such as the bishops of Constantinople were. Surely this evasion will not serve the turn. For Gregory saith in the same place, that no bishop of Rome ever assumed this title, *ne dum privatum aliquid daretur uni, honore debito sacerdotes privarentur universi*: that is, "Lest while some singular thing were given to one, all bishops should be deprived of their due honour:" thereby showing that this title, and the claims accompanying it, are simply to be disliked, as prejudicial to the state of the whole Church, and the honour and dignity of all other bishops, by whomsoever they be made. Some man perhaps will be desirous to know how our adversaries seek to decline the evidence of this clear testimony of so great a Roman bishop, witnessing against them in a matter of so great consequence. I will therefore set down briefly in this place what I find anywhere said by any of them in answer to this authority. The credit of the author is such, that they dare take no exception against him; and the generality of his speech is such, that what he disliketh in the Constantinopolitan bishop, he confesseth to be evil in any other, and particularly in the bishop of Rome. And therefore the only thing that they can devise whereby to darken the clear light of truth, is this; that the bishop of Constantinople did so and in such sense challenge to be universal bishop, that he only would have been a bishop, and there should have been no more; than which nothing could be more absurdly said. For the thing that the Roman bishops disliked in those of Constantinople, was not the putting of all other from being bishops, but the preferring themselves before other, the subjecting of other to themselves, the encroaching upon the privileges and rights of other, and the challenging of the power of ordination, and confirmation of them, whom it pertained not to them to ordain or confirm; as appeareth by the epistles of Leo¹, blaming Anatolius for sub-

¹ "Post illa itaque ordinationis tuæ non inculpata principia, post consecrationem Antiocheni episcopi quam tibimet contra regulam canonicam vindicasti, doleo etiam in hoc dilectionem tuam esse prolapsum ut sacratissimas Nicænorum canonum constitutiones conareris infringere: tanquam opportune se tibi hoc tempus obtulerit quo

jecting all unto himself, for depriving other metropolitans of their due honour, by encroaching upon their rights, and for taking upon him to ordain the bishop of Antioch, who was one of the patriarchs. That the bishops of Constantinople sought not so to be universal bishops, that there should be no other bishops but they only, is most evident by the epistles of Leo and Gregory¹, in that they ordained bishops themselves, and are blamed by them for presuming to ordain such as they should not have ordained. Wherefore the most that they can be conceived to have desired and sought in assuming the title of universality, is no more but the investing of the fulness of all power and jurisdiction ecclesiastical originally in themselves, and thereby the subjecting of all other to a necessity of deriving ministerial power and authority from them; of seeking ordination at their hands, and being in all things pertaining to episcopal office subject to them: all which things are challenged by the bishop of Rome. For the Romanists at this day teach, that the fulness of all power and jurisdiction ecclesiastical is originally in the pope, and that he communicateth a part thereof unto others, with such limitations as seemeth best unto himself; that all other bishops receive their jurisdiction from him; that all the bishops of the world cannot judge him; that he may dispose of all the kingdoms of the world; that his standing is the stay of all; that his fall would be the ruin of all; and that therefore we must persuade ourselves he cannot err. And hence indeed it followeth, that he only is bishop in truth, and that there are no other. For if the pope may take from any bishop, so often as he seeth cause, as many as he pleaseth of them that are subject to him; if he may reserve unto himself what cases he will, and inhibit bishops to meddle with them; if he may give leave to preach, minister sacraments, and to do all other ecclesiastical duties, to whom he will, within any diocese of the world; if in general councils, where the power of jurisdiction is principally exercised, where the great affairs of the Church are treated of, where doubts are resolved, controversies determined, articles

secundi honoris privilegium sedes Alexandrina perdiderit, et Antiochena ecclesia proprietatem tertiæ dignitatis amiserit: ut his locis juri tuo subditis omnes metropolitani episcopi proprio honore priventur.—Leo, Epist. liii. [Al. Epist. cvi. Tom. i. col. 1161. Ven. 1753.]

¹ Vid. Epist. Gregor. supra citat.

of faith defined, and laws made that bind the whole Church, he have so absolute power, that he is neither bound to follow the greater nor the lesser part of bishops there present, but may determine what he pleaseth, when they have all done and said what they can; if the assurance of finding out the truth, and decreeing that which is good and behoofful, rest not partly in him and partly in them, but only in him, as our adversaries teach;—then are bishops indeed no bishops; no judges of controversies, but counsellors only to advise the pope; no lawgivers to the Church, but such as must receive laws from the pope; no commanders in their own right in the Church in any degree, but mere lieutenants, or, to speak more truly and properly, vassals to the pope.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

OF THE PROOFS BROUGHT BY THE ROMANISTS FOR CONFIRMATION OF THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE POPE'S JURISDICTION AND POWER.

IT is evident by that which hath been said, that that universality, whereof Gregory speaketh in his epistles, and which he so peremptorily condemneth, is claimed by the popes his successors at this day; and consequently, that they are in his judgment the forerunners of antichrist, and in pride like Lucifer. Yet because there is nothing so absurd, that some will not defend; nothing so false, which some will not endeavour to prove true; let us see what the Romanists can say for proof and confirmation of the universal jurisdiction of their popes. Surely as men careful to uphold the state of the papacy, under the shadow of the boughs of which tree they so sweetly rest, and repose themselves, they have turned over their books to see what may be said, and out of them allege against us the testimonies of councils, popes, fathers Greek and Latin, and the practice of popes, whence such a peerless power may be proved and inferred.

The first testimony that they bring out of any council is out of the epistle written by the fathers of the second general

council to Damasus bishop of Rome¹, and the other bishops of the West; wherein the fathers say, (if we believe these men) that they came together to Constantinople by the mandate of the pope, whose letters the emperor sent unto them; and confess that the Roman Church is the head, and they the members. Truly this is a very ill beginning, and may make us justly fear that we shall find little good dealing in that which followeth. For there is no part of this true, which in the front of all their proofs is by them so confidently alleged. For thus the matter standeth between the fathers of that council and the bishop of Rome. The bishops assembled at Constantinople writ to the bishop of Rome, and the rest of the bishops of the West assembled in a council at Rome, signifying, that they had been invited by them out of their brotherly love, as their own members, to come to their council; and that they wished nothing more than that they had the wings of doves, that they might fly away and rest with them: but that the state of their Churches not permitting them to be so long absent, and that intending at the time they understood of their letters to come no farther than Constantinople, they could not come, but had sent notwithstanding certain unto them. This is all that is contained in the letter of those fathers written to the bishop of Rome: in all which there is no word of any mandate of the pope, but of a friendly and loving entreaty of the western bishops, desiring the presence of their brethren of the East; no word of head and members,

¹ "Secundum concilium generale in Epist. ad Damasum, quæ exstat apud Theodoretum, lib. v. Hist. cap. 9, dicit se convenisse apud urbem Constantinopolim ex mandato literarum pontificis per Imperatorem ad se missarum. Et ibidem fatentur Romanam ecclesiam caput esse, se autem membra."—Bellarm. De Rom. Pontif. Lib. II. cap. 13. [Tom. I. p. 315.]

"Ἐπειδὴ μέντοι τὴν ἀδελφικὴν περὶ ἡμᾶς ἀγάπην ἐπιδεικνύμενοι σύνοδον ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης Θεοῦ βουλήσει συγκροτοῦντες καὶ ἡμᾶς ὡς οἰκεία μέλη προσεκάλεσασθε διὰ τῶν τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως γραμμάτων, κ. τ. λ."—Epist. Concil. Constant. ad Damas. apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. cap. 9. [p. 204, Cantabr. 1720.]

"Cum itaque constet primam synodum a Sylvestro indictam a Constantino promotam fuisse, concedendum est hanc quoque secundam universalem synodum auctoritate sedis pontificiæ indictam et auxilio imperatoris congregatam esse."—Binius, in not. ad Concil. Constant. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1153.]

but of fellow-members, nor any thing that may prove a commanding power in the pope. Nay, the contrary is most strongly from hence to be proved. For it was the emperor, and not the pope, that called them to Constantinople; they refused to come to Rome, though they had received the letters of the Roman bishop and his colleagues, intreating and desiring them to come to Rome; they abode at Constantinople, and were esteemed to be the general council, though the pope held a council in the West at the same time; which should have been accounted general, rather than this, if all assurance of finding out the truth and making good laws did rest in the pope only: and lastly, they ordained bishops of the greatest and most famous Churches of the world, such, and in such sort, as the pope did not greatly like, and yet was forced to give way to their doings, and to ratify that which they had done.

The second allegation to prove the universality of the pope's jurisdiction, is, that the fathers of the third general council, holden at Ephesus¹, professed that they deposed Nestorius by force of the mandatory letters of Cœlestinus bishop of Rome, and that in their epistle to Cœlestinus they say, they reserved the judgment of the cause of John, patriarch of Antioch, to him, as being more doubtful. The former of these two things they endeavour to prove out of Evagrius²; the latter out of the epistle written by the fathers of that council, extant in the council itself. For the clearing of this objection we must observe that Nestorius³, patriarch of Con-

¹ "Tertium concilium, ut est apud Evagrium, Lib. i. Hist. cap. 4, dicit se deponere Nestorium ex mandato literarum Cœlestini papæ Romani. Et in epistola ad eundem Cœlestinum idem concilium scribit se causam Joannis patriarchæ Antiocheni quæ magis dubia erat quam causa Nestorii non fuisse ausum judicare, sed reservasse judicio ipsius Cœlestini: quæ omnia perspicue indicant supremam Romani pontificis auctoritatem." — Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "Ἀναγκαίως κατεπειχθέντες ἀπό τε τῶν κανόνων, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ Κελεστίνου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας, δακρύσαντες πολλάκις ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν σκυθρωπὸν ἐχωρήσαμεν ἀπόφασιν. Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς τοίνυν παρ' αὐτοῦ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὥρισε διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἁγίας συνόδου, ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τοῦ τε ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος καὶ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱερατικοῦ." — Epist. Concil. Ephes. apud Evagr. Hist. Eccles. Lib. i. cap. 4. p. 254, Cantabr. 1720.]

³ See these things in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, the seventh Book of Socrates' Hist., and the first of Evagrius.

stantinople, having uttered certain heretical and impious speeches touching the personal union of the natures of God and man in Christ, whereby many were scandalized, the first amongst the patriarchs that took notice of it was Cyril bishop of Alexandria in Egypt; who after he found that Nestorius would not be reclaimed by admonitions, called a synod of his bishops, and condemned the absurd and heretical positions of Nestorius, and required him to anathematize them; otherwise threatening that he and his bishops would reject him from their communion, and hold them as brethren who under his jurisdiction resisted against him. This his proceeding he signified to the bishop of Rome, who approved and commended the same; and with his whole synod of western bishops encouraged him to go forward; wishing him not to doubt of his concurrence with him, but, as having all the authority and power he and his bishops had, to provide for the Church of Constantinople, and to let Nestorius know, that he was cut off from the unity of the body of their Churches, if he should not within a certain number of days anathematize his wicked doctrine, and profess the faith touching the generation of Christ the Son of God, which the Roman Church, the Church of Alexandria, and Christian religion everywhere, preacheth. Hereupon Nestorius, fearing the course that Cyril would take against him, desired the emperor to summon a general council. To this council came Nestorius, and the bishops that were under him; and Cyril with his bishops, assisted with the concurrence of the resolution and direction of the bishop of Rome, and other bishops of the West, though absent; but John, the patriarch of Antioch, and his bishops, were not come. Whereupon after a while, the bishops that were present, being weary of staying there, began to proceed without him, requiring Nestorius to appear in the synod, and to answer to such things as should be objected to him; which when he refused to do, the fathers assembled, finding by manifest proof that he had taught impiously, condemned and deposed him, compelled so to do by the canons, and the letters of the bishop of Rome, and his western bishops, who had set a time within which if he submitted not himself they would reject him from their communion. Five days after the condemnation and deposition of Nestorius, came John the patriarch of Antioch with his bishops, excusing himself for his

long tarrying in respect of the distance of the place from whence he came, as also for that his bishops could not sooner be gathered together. He was much offended that they who were come before him had passed their sentence before his coming; and thereupon without delay, before he had put off his cloak, or shaken off the dust from his feet, as the story saith¹, assembling the bishops subject to him in a synod, deposed Cyril and Memnon bishop of Ephesus, who were chief agents in the proceedings against Nestorius: which deposition of Cyril and Memnon was something hastily confirmed by the emperor Theodosius. This synod assembled under Cyril in like sort gave sentence against John, and signified to Cœlestinus bishop of Rome what they had done, showing how unadvisedly a few had presumed to condemn a great many, and the bishop of the third see bishops of greater sees, to wit, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cœlestinus of Rome, who was present in the council by his vicegerent: yet referring the final proceeding to his consideration also, he and his bishops being

¹ “Simul atque Ephesum ingressus est (Joannes Antiochenus), antequam pulverem ex itinere contractum excussisset, pallio nondum deposito, coactis in unum quasi collegio quopiam triginta plus minus solo nomine episcopis, qui una cum Nestorio desciverant, blasphemaque verba in proprium caput evomerant. . . rem ausus est impiam qualem nemo ante illum ausus est unquam. Etenim privatim scriptum quoddam confecit, depositionisque nomine sanctissimo Deoque dilectissimo Cyrillo Alexandrinorum episcopo, et pientissimo fratri et comministro nostro Memnoni Ephesiorum episcopo indignam contumeliam imponere studuit; idque omnibus nobis insciis, immo ne ipsis quidem qui injuriam hanc perpassi sunt quid ageretur, aut quamnam ob causam hoc ausi essent intelligentibus.”—Epist. Sacræ Synodi Ephesinæ ad Cœlestinum Romanæ urbis Archiepiscopum. Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. Tom. iv. cap. 17. [Bin. Tom. i. p. 804.]

[“ Ἄμα τε γὰρ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν, πρὶν ἀποπλύνασθαι τὴν ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας κόνιν, πρὶν ἀποδύσασθαι τὸ ἱμάτιον, συναγαγὼν τινὰς τῶν τῷ Νεστορίῳ συναποστατησάντων, καὶ βλασφήμα λαλούντων κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν κεφαλῆς, καὶ μονονουχὶ καταπαιζόντων τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ συλλέξας ὥσπερ κολλήγιον ἑαυτῷ τριάκοντά που τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ἀνθρώπων ἐπισκόπων ἔχόντων ὄνομα, . . . πρᾶγμα τετόλμηκεν ἀνόσιον, ὃ μηδεὶς πώποτε τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ. Συνάπτει γὰρ καταμόνας χαρτίον, καὶ δὴ καθαιρέσεως ὄνομα καὶ ὕβριν προσετρίψατο τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπισκόπῳ Κυρίλλῳ, καὶ τῷ θεοσεβεστάτῳ ἡμῶν ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Μέμνονι τῷ τῆς Ἐφεσίων, οὐδενὸς ἡμῶν εἰδότος, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τῶν ὕβρισθέντων ἐγνωκότων τὸ δρώμενον, ἢ διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν τοῦτο τετολμήκασιν.”—Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1192.]

as much interested in this business as they that were assembled. In the end, by mediation of many great and worthy ones, John and his bishops, that formerly were misconceited of Cyril, were satisfied, and he sent the confession of his faith unto him; which he approved, and so they were reconciled, and made friends, without any farther intermeddling of the bishop of Rome. Here is nothing to be found that any way argueth or importeth an universality of power in the bishop of Rome, but only his concurrence with the other patriarchs, as prime patriarch, in the weighty and important businesses of the Church: and therefore the fathers of that council¹, writing to the vicars of the bishop of Rome and other bishops, sent by them to the emperor, to inform him concerning the differences that had arisen in the council, and their proceedings, charge and require them to do nothing but according to their direction; assuring them, that if they do otherwise, they will neither ratify that they do, nor admit them to their communion: thereby showing, that though the Roman bishop be to concur with the fathers assembled in councils, yet he is not absolutely there to command, but to follow the directions of the major part. So that he hath a joint interest with others, but not an absolute sovereignty over all others; God therefore having ordained the high tops of patriarchal dignities (as it is in the eighth general council²) that they might jointly concur to uphold the state of the Church, and the truth of religion; and that if one fell, the rest might restore, settle, and re-establish things again. Which course Cyril³, in

¹ “Εἰδέναι δὲ βουλόμεθα τὴν ὑμετέραν ὁσιότητα ὅτι περ εἴ τι τούτων παροφθείη παρ’ ὑμῶν, οὔτε ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος καταδέξεται τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν πραττόμενα, οὔτε ὑμᾶς ἔξει κοινωνούς.”—Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, col. 1313.]

² Apud Binium, Conciliorum, Tom. III. Part. 2. Act. I. p. 881. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 490.]

³ “Ὡς [Νεστορίῳ] καὶ συνεβούλευσα διὰ γραμμάτων ἀποσχέσθαι τῶν οὕτω σκαιῶν καὶ ἐξεστραμμένων ζητημάτων, καὶ τῇ τῶν πατέρων ἀκολουθῆσαι πίστει, ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ μὲν ὥθη ταῦτα γράφοντα δυσμενῇ . . . Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνάγκη με γραψάσης τῆς αὐτοῦ εὐσεβείας ἐκείσε ταῦτα τὰ γεγόνота εἰπεῖν ἅπαντα, πέμψαι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἴσα τῶν παρ’ ἐμοῦ γραφέντων πρὸς αὐτὸν γραμμάτων, ἐκδεδήμηκεν ἀναγκαίως κληρικὸς τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ὁ ἀγαπητὸς διάκονος Ποσειδώνιος. Ἀναγνωθείσων τοίνυν ἐν συνεδρίῳ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ἡ ἁγία Ῥωμαίων σύνοδος φανερὰ τετύπωκε, κ. τ. λ.

“Γεγράφασι δ’ οὐδὲν ἡσσον καὶ πρὸς τὸν τῆς Αἰλίων θεοσεβέστατον ἐπισκοπον Ἰουβενάλιον.”—Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, col. 929.]

his epistle to John of Antioch, sheweth to have been holden by him: for when he observed that Nestorius his fellow-patriarch erred from the faith, he first admonished him, and threatened to reject him from the communion of his churches. Secondly, he acquainted the bishop of Rome and the western bishops with the impieties and blasphemies of Nestorius; who thereupon rejected him, professing that they would admit none to their communion but such as would condemn him. Thirdly, he wrote to Juvenal bishop of Jerusalem, and to John bishop of Antioch, showing his own dislike of Nestorius; and farther professing, that for his part he was fearful to be cast out of the communion of the western bishops, as he saw he must be, if he accursed not Nestorius.

The next allegation is out of the council of Chalcedon¹, where Theodorus and Ischiron, deacons, in their bills of complaint exhibited to the bishop of Rome as president, and to the whole council, call Leo the bishop, “Most holy and most blessed universal archbishop and patriarch of great Rome.” But they that press the testimony of these two distressed deacons, flying to Leo for help, should remember, that in the council of Constantinople² under Mennas, not deacons, but bishops, and they many, are reported to have written to the bishop of Constantinople in this sort: “To our most holy lord, and most blessed father of fathers, John, the archbishop, and universal patriarch;” and Mennas³ himself also is called “Œcumenical Patriarch,” and “Archbishop,” oftentimes in

¹ “Concilium Chalcedonense, Act. 1, 2, et 3, passim vocat Leonem ‘universalis ecclesiæ pontificem.’ Et in Epist. ad Leonem: ‘Et post hæc,’ inquiunt, ‘omnia insuper et contra ipsum cui vineæ custodia a salvatore commissa est extendit insaniam, id est contra tuam quoque apostolicam sanctitatem.’ Hic vides maximum concilium confiteri, Romano pontifici a Deo ipso vineæ, id est ecclesiæ universæ custodiam esse commissam.”—Bellarm. [p. 315.]

“Τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ οἰκουμενικῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ πατριάρχῃ τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης Λέοντι, κ. τ. λ.”—Epist. Theodor. Diac. inter Act. Synod. Chalced. Act. III. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1268.]

² “Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου τῷ θεοφιλεστάτῳ καὶ ὀσιωτάτῳ συλλειτουργῷ Ἰωάννῃ.”—Epist. Joann. Hierosol. [Act. V. Labbe, Tom. V. col. 1160.]

“Τῷ δεσπότῃ ἡμῶν τῷ πάντα ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ πατρὶ πατέρων, ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ Ἰωάννῃ.”—Epist. Episc. secundæ Syriæ. [Labbe, col. 1184.]

³ “Ὁ ἀγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος οἰκουμενικὸς ἀρχιεπίσκοπος καὶ πατριάρχης Μεννᾶς, κ. τ. λ.”—[Ibid. Act. IV. col. 1053.]

that council of Constantinople: and yet, I think, they will not acknowledge the bishops of Constantinople to have had an universal supreme commanding power over the whole world.

Hereunto therefore they add another proof out of the relation of the council of Chalcedon¹ made to Leo; wherein the fathers complain of Dioscorus, that as a wild boar he had violently entered into the vineyard of the Lord, and wasted the same, plucking up the true fruitful vines, and planting unfruitful in their places; and that he stayed not there, but reached out his hand against him to whom the keeping of the vineyard was committed by our Saviour, that is, against the bishop of Rome, whom he thought to excommunicate. These words we willingly confess to be words of just complaint, upon great cause made by the fathers of the council, against Dioscorus: but they prove not the thing in question. For we make no doubt but the keeping of the vineyard of the Lord of hosts was committed to the bishop of Rome, not only as well as to other, but in the first place, as being in order and honour the chief: but that he only received from Christ this power, authority, and charge, and others from him, not we only, but many learned amongst themselves, do deny, as Bellarmine testifieth².

There are two other testimonies that may be alleged out of the council of Chalcedon. For Paschasinus, one of the vicegerents of the bishop of Rome in that council, calleth Rome³ the head of the churches, and Leo⁴ the bishop of

¹ “Καὶ ἦν ἂν ὁ ἀντικείμενος ὡς θῆρ ἔξω τῆς μάνδρας καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ὠρυόμενος, . . . καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἅπασιν ἔτι κατ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου τὴν φυλάκην παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐπιτετραμμένην τὴν μανίαν ἐξέτεινε, λέγομεν δὴ τῆς σῆς ὁσιότητος.”—Relat. Concil. Chalced. ad Leon. Act. xvi. [Labbe, col. 1776.]

² “Quæstio est an episcopi canonice electi accipiunt a Deo suam jurisdictionem, sicut eam accipit summus pontifex, an vero a pontifice.”—Bellarm. de Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 22. [Tom. i. p. 429.]

³ “Πασχασῖνος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος φύλαξ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου, ὡς ἔσται ἐν μέσῳ μετὰ καὶ τῶν συνελθόντων αὐτῷ, ἔφη· Τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἀποστολικοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως, κεφαλῆς ὑπάρχοντος πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, προστάξεις ἔχομεν, κ.τ.λ.”—Concil. Chalced. Act. i. [Labbe, col. 864.]

⁴ “Sanctissimus et beatissimus papa, caput universalis ecclesiæ, Leo, &c.”—In Exempl. Epist. Paschagini. In Concil. Chalced. Bin. Tom. ii. p. 141. [Vid. Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1303.]

Rome, head of the universal church. But they who press so much the saying of the pope's legate in favour of the pope, must know, that by head he meant chief in order and honour, and not one having all power originally in himself, and absolutely commanding over all, as the papists now teach. For if he had meant so, he had not been endured by the fathers of that council, who peremptorily pronounce¹, that it was the greatness of the city, and not any power given by Christ or derived to him from Peter, that made the bishop of Rome to be great; and that therefore they would equal the bishop of Constantinople unto him, seeing Constantinople was now become equal unto Rome.

The next testimony that they allege is out of the patriarchal council of Constantinople² under Mennas, wherein the fathers profess by Mennas their president, that they follow and obey the apostolic see, that they communicate with them with whom that see communicateth, and condemn all those it condemneth. Surely, this reason, howsoever it may seem to have some force, yet indeed hath none at all. For there is no question, but that the bishop of Rome, with his western synods, all which, according to the phrase of antiquity, are comprehended under the name of the apostolic see, was more to be esteemed than the particular synod under Mennas: and that therefore they might profess to follow it, and obey the decrees of it; and yet neither think the pope to be universal bishop, nor that the bishop of Rome, with his western bishops, is more to be listened unto and obeyed than all the other bishops of the Christian world. That Adrian³, the bishop of Rome, in his epistle to Tharasius, inserted into the seventh

¹ “Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασιν τὰ πρεσβεῖα· καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ῥν'. θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ.”—Concil. Chalced. Act. xv. [Labbe, col. 1692.]

² “Ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ ἐξακολουθοῦμέν τε καὶ πειθόμεθα, καὶ τοὺς κοινωνικοὺς αὐτοῦ κοινωνικοὺς ἔχομεν, καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατακριθέντας καὶ ἡμεῖς κατακρίνομεν.”—Concil. Constant. sub Menna. Act. iv. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 1057.]

³ “Οὗ [Πέτρου] ὁ θρόνος εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην πρωτεύων διαλάμπει· καὶ κεφαλὴ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχει.”—Hadrian. Epist. ad Tharas. in Concil. vii. [Nicæn. ii.] Act. ii. [Labbe, Tom. viii. col. 772.]

general council, saith, that the see of Rome hath the primacy throughout the whole world, and is the head of all Churches (which is the last allegation of Bellarmine out of councils), is no more than we granted before, if it be rightly understood of a primacy of order and honour, and not of an universal, supreme, commanding power over all.

This is all that Bellarmine can allege out of any ancient council: in which his allegations it will not be amiss for the reader to observe his guileful cunning; who undertaking to produce the testimonies of ancient councils for confirmation of the papacy, bringeth nothing for the most part but the words of particular men, and they either suitors to the pope, agents for him, or popes. To that which he hath out of later councils, as that of Lateran under Innocentius, and that of Lyons, and Florence, I will answer when I come to show the opinions of later times touching the pope's universality of jurisdiction and power; and therefore will pass them over in this place.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

OF THE PRETENDED PROOFS OF THE POPE'S JURISDICTION
TAKEN OUT OF THE DECRETAL EPISTLES OF POPES.

THE next proofs that are brought for confirmation of the universality of papal jurisdiction, are the sayings of popes in their decretal epistles. These epistles Bellarmine¹ sorteth into three ranks, placing in the first the epistles of those

¹ "Tertium argumentum sumitur a summorum pontificum sententiis. Est autem observandum epistolas pontificum in tres quasi classes distribui posse.

"Prima classis continet epistolas pontificum qui sederunt usque ad annum 300. Secunda classis complectitur epistolas eorum pontificum qui sederunt ab anno 600, usque ad nostra tempora.

"Tertia classis comprehendit illas epistolas in quibus et aperte asseritur primatus, et quas constat esse scriptas a sanctis et veris pontificibus, qui floruerunt ab anno 300 ad 600.

"Ad hæc testimonia nihil respondent, nisi esse recentia et supposititia. At quamvis aliquos errores in eas irrepsisse non negaverim, nec indubitatas esse affirmare audeam; certe tamen antiquissimas esse nihil dubito."—Bellarm. De Pontif. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 14. [Tom. I. p. 316.]

popes that lived within the first three hundred years: in the second, the epistles of those that lived after the first six hundred years: and in the third, the epistles of such as came in the midst between these.

Touching the first, he confesseth, that certain errors have crept into them, and that he dareth not pronounce them to be indubitate; but cardinal Cusanus, a man of great learning, reading, and judgment, minceth not the matter as Bellarmine doth, but plainly and in direct words professeth that he thinketh these epistles that go under the names of ancient popes are counterfeit. His words are these¹: “In my opinion the things that are written of Constantine and his donation are apocryphal, as also perhaps some other long and large writings attributed to the holy men Clemens and Anacletus the pope, on which they that desire to magnify the Roman see, which is worthy of all honour, and to exalt it more than is expedient for the Church, or is any way fit, do either altogether or in some sort ground themselves. For, assuredly, if any man would diligently read over and peruse all the writings attributed to those holy men, and compare the times wherein they lived with those writings, and then would be conversant in the works of all the holy fathers, which were till the time of Augustine, Hierome, and Ambrose; and in the books of councils, wherein authenticall writings are

¹ “Sunt meo iudicio illa de Constantino apocrypha, sicut fortassis etiam quædam alia longa et magna scripta sanctis Clementi et Anacleto papæ attributa. In quibus volentes Romanam sedem omni laude dignam plusquam ecclesiæ sanctæ expedit et decet exaltare, se penitus aut quasi fundant. Si quis illas omnes scripturas illis sanctis attributas diligenter perlegeret, et eorum tempora ad illa scripta applicaret, ac deinde in opusculis omnium sanctorum patrum qui usque ad Augustinum, Hieronymum, et Ambrosium fuere, ac etiam de gestis conciliorum, ubi authentica scripta allegantur usum et memoriam haberet; hoc inveniret verum, quia nec in illis omnibus scripturis de illis præfatis epistolis mentio habetur, et etiam ipsæ epistolæ applicatæ ad tempus eorum sanctorum seipsas produnt. Scribitur in Clementis epistolis, quomodo papa fuerit et Petri successor, et post Petri mortem ad sanctum Jacobum has fingit scriptor misisse epistolas qui fuit frater Domini et Hierosolymorum episcopus, et est manifestum Jacobum prius Petro octo annis finisse martyrio vitam. Et hæc una de causis, cur inter catholicas epistolas ea quæ Jacobi sunt præcedunt, ut scribit Beda super Canonicis epistolis in principio.”—Cusan. Concord. Cathol. Lib. III. cap. 2. [p. 782. Bas. 1565.]

alleged, committing them to memory, and making use of them, he would find this to be true, that neither any mention is made of those forenamed epistles in any of those writings, nor that the epistles compared with the times wherein their supposed authors lived, can be made to agree with the times of their life; but by the very circumstance of time bewray themselves to be counterfeit. It is written in the epistles of Clemens, how he was made pope and succeeded Peter; and after the death of Peter, the author of these epistles writeth unto James, who was brother of our Lord and bishop of Jerusalem; and yet it is most manifest that the same James died eight years before Peter, which was one of the causes (as Beda writeth in his commentaries upon the canonical epistles) why the Epistle of James is set first among the catholic epistles." Neither is this the censure of Cusanus only, but Contius¹, a learned canonist, in his annotations upon Gratian, feareth not to pronounce all the decretal epistles, that go under the names of such bishops as lived before Sylvester, to be false and counterfeit.

Besides these censures of learned men, there want not strong and effectual reasons to disprove these epistles. For first, they will easily appear to be counterfeit, because they are barbarously and rudely written, and are not like the writings of those men that lived in the times wherein the supposed authors of those epistles did live, but like the writings of such as lived in later and worse times, after barbarism had prevailed and overflowed all. Secondly, because the style is so different from those indubitate remainders of the epistles of the same popes, found in Cyprian², Eusebius³, and Athanasius⁴, that they cannot be but counterfeit: for whosoever shall compare them, shall find them to differ as much as gold and dross. Thirdly, for that all these supposed epistles are so like one another in style, and oftentimes have the very same sentences, that it is very likely they came all from one and the same forge. Fourthly, because neither Eusebius, Hierome, nor any other ancient writer, maketh any mention of them. Fifthly,

¹ Contius, Annot. in Dist. xxvi. cap. 70.

² Cyprian. Epist. xlvi. et xlviii. In edit. Pamel. [Al. xlix. et l. pp. 92, 94. Oxon. 1682.]

³ Euseb. H. E. Lib. vi. cap. 42.

⁴ Athanas. Apolog. ii. [Tom. i. p. 141.]

because they follow not the old translation in their allegations of scripture, but that of Hierome, which was not in being in those times wherein the supposed authors of these epistles did live. Lastly, which is the reason before used by Cusanus¹, because the epistle to James, written after the death of Peter, as appeareth in the front of it, and so consequently after the twelfth year of Nero, could not be written to James the brother of our Lord, who, as Hierome² testifieth, was slain at Jerusalem in the seventh year of Nero. But whatsoever become of the censure of learned men branding these epistles with the note of forgery, and the reasons brought to disprove them, which cannot easily be answered: yet Bellarmine will prove that these epistles are mentioned by the ancient, and consequently that the Century writers³ say untruly, that hardly any shall be found before the time of Charles the Great that speaketh any thing of them⁴. To this purpose he produceth Isidore, in his preface before his collection of the councils, affirming that he gathered canons out of the epistles of Clemens, Anacletus, Evaristus, and the rest of the Roman bishops, by the advice of eighty bishops; but this is to justify one counterfeit by another; for this preface is thought to be counterfeit, because in it there is mention made of the sixth general council under Agatho, whereas Isidore was dead forty years before the holding of that council. Wherefore he allegeth the council of Vase, as mentioning the same decretals. But the decrees of that council are uncertain, as Binus⁵

¹ Loco citato [P. 280, supra.] Vide etiam Binium in Annot. in Epist. Clement. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 98.]

² "Triginta annos Hierosolymorum rexit ecclesiam, id est, usque ad septimum Neronis annum."—Hieron. In Catal. Script. Eccles. [Al. De Vir. Illustr.] In Jacobo. [Tom. ii. col. 819.]

³ "Nec facile reperias has epistolas ab ullo patrum aut fide digno auctore ab hoc seculo usque ad Caroli Magni ætatem citari."—Cent. Magdeb. Cent. ii. cap. 7. ad fin. [Tom. ii. col. 116. Bas. 1624.]

⁴ "Mentiuntur Magdeburgenses, cum dicunt nullum fide dignum auctorem citasse has epistolas ante tempora Caroli Magni. Nam Isidorus qui 200 annis antiquior est Carolo in proem. sui collect. sac. Can., dicit se ex consilio 80 episcoporum collegisse canones ex epistolis Clementis Anacleti, Evaristi, et cæterorum Romanorum pontificum. Item concilium Vasense can. 6. citat epistolas Clementis, ut nunc exstant."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

⁵ "Sicut acta et decreta hujus concilii propter miram canonum

noteth, by reason of the great confusion that is found in them: and truly, I think, there is no man that can make any sense of that which is cited out of Clement's epistles by that council. Therefore in the third place he addeth Ruffinus, who in his preface before his translation of the Recognitions of Clemens out of Greek, speaketh of an epistle of Clement unto James the brother of our Lord, and saith he turned it out of Greek into Latin: and this, saith Bellarmine, which we have, is undoubtedly the same that he translated, as may be proved out of Gennadius¹: therefore the epistle that is now carried about under the name of Clemens is ancient, and not late or counterfeit. But that these Philistines may fall by their own sword, we will oppose against Bellarmine the cardinal, Baronius the cardinal, against the Roman reader of controversies, the Roman annalist. For Baronius² proveth out of Gennadius³, whom Bellarmine allegeth, that these epistles we have are not the same that Ruffinus translated, because those he translated had prefaces before them, but this of Clement hath none. Thus we see the epistles of the popes of the first three hundred years prove nothing, because they are counterfeit.

Of them that were written by such as lived after the first six hundred years, I shall have a fit opportunity to speak in another place. Wherefore let us come to those of the middle rank, where Bellarmine produceth twelve ancient bishops of Rome, claiming that supreme, absolute, and

confusionem incerta sunt, ita quam ob causam celebratum sit certo affirmari nequit.—Bin. Annot. ad Concil. Vasens. ii. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 721.]

¹ “Denique Ruffinus qui annis 400 præcessit Carolum, præfat. in recognit. Clement. a se conversas ex Græco, meminit Epistolæ Clementis ad Jacobum, et eam se vertisse dicit ex Græco. Esse autem vere hanc versionem Ruffini testatur Gennadius, Lib. de Vir. Illustr. in Ruffino.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² “Gennadius de Ruffino agens in cunctis se e Græco editis versionibus præfationem imponere testatur; adeo ut quæ sine prologo reperiuntur esse translata, non Ruffini sed alterius esse opus affirmet.”—Baron. Anno Dom. 102. num. 6. [Tom. ii. p. 13. Antv. 1617.]

³ “Horum omnium quæcunque præmissis prologis a Latinis leguntur a Ruffino interpretata sunt, quæ autem sine prologo ab alio translata sunt qui prologum facere noluit.”—Gennad. de Viris Illustr. cap. 17. [Inter Opp. Hieron. Tom. ii. col. 960.] Citat. etiam in Annot. Bini ad Epist. i. Clement. ad Jacobum. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 98.]

because they follow not the old translation in their allegations of scripture, but that of Hierome, which was not in being in those times wherein the supposed authors of these epistles did live. Lastly, which is the reason before used by Cusanus¹, because the epistle to James, written after the death of Peter, as appeareth in the front of it, and so consequently after the twelfth year of Nero, could not be written to James the brother of our Lord, who, as Hierome² testifieth, was slain at Jerusalem in the seventh year of Nero. But whatsoever become of the censure of learned men branding these epistles with the note of forgery, and the reasons brought to disprove them, which cannot easily be answered: yet Bellarmine will prove that these epistles are mentioned by the ancient, and consequently that the Century writers³ say untruly, that hardly any shall be found before the time of Charles the Great that speaketh any thing of them⁴. To this purpose he produceth Isidore, in his preface before his collection of the councils, affirming that he gathered canons out of the epistles of Clemens, Anacletus, Evaristus, and the rest of the Roman bishops, by the advice of eighty bishops; but this is to justify one counterfeit by another; for this preface is thought to be counterfeit, because in it there is mention made of the sixth general council under Agatho, whereas Isidore was dead forty years before the holding of that council. Wherefore he allegeth the council of Vase, as mentioning the same decretals. But the decrees of that council are uncertain, as Binius⁵

¹ Loco citato [P. 280, supra.] Vide etiam Binium in Annot. in Epist. Clement. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 98.]

² "Triginta annos Hierosolymorum rexit ecclesiam, id est, usque ad septimum Neronis annum."—Hieron. In Catal. Script. Eccles. [Al. De Vir. Illustr.] In Jacobo. [Tom. ii. col. 819.]

³ "Nec facile reperias has epistolas ab ullo patrum aut fide digno auctore ab hoc seculo usque ad Caroli Magni ætatem citari."—Cent. Magdeb. Cent. ii. cap. 7. ad fin. [Tom. ii. col. 116. Bas. 1624.]

⁴ "Mentiuntur Magdeburgenses, cum dicunt nullum fide dignum auctorem citasse has epistolas ante tempora Caroli Magni. Nam Isidorus qui 200 annis antiquior est Carolo in proem. sui collect. sac. Can., dicit se ex consilio 80 episcoporum collegisse canones ex epistolis Clementis Anacleti, Evaristi, et cæterorum Romanorum pontificum. Item concilium Vasense can. 6. citat epistolas Clementis, ut nunc exstant."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

⁵ "Sicut acta et decreta hujus concilii propter miram canonum

noteth, by reason of the great confusion that is found in them: and truly, I think, there is no man that can make any sense of that which is cited out of Clement's epistles by that council. Therefore in the third place he addeth Ruffinus, who in his preface before his translation of the Recognitions of Clemens out of Greek, speaketh of an epistle of Clement unto James the brother of our Lord, and saith he turned it out of Greek into Latin: and this, saith Bellarmine, which we have, is undoubtedly the same that he translated, as may be proved out of Gennadius¹: therefore the epistle that is now carried about under the name of Clemens is ancient, and not late or counterfeit. But that these Philistines may fall by their own sword, we will oppose against Bellarmine the cardinal, Baronius the cardinal, against the Roman reader of controversies, the Roman annalist. For Baronius² proveth out of Gennadius³, whom Bellarmine allegeth, that these epistles we have are not the same that Ruffinus translated, because those he translated had prefaces before them, but this of Clement hath none. Thus we see the epistles of the popes of the first three hundred years prove nothing, because they are counterfeit.

Of them that were written by such as lived after the first six hundred years, I shall have a fit opportunity to speak in another place. Wherefore let us come to those of the middle rank, where Bellarmine produceth twelve ancient bishops of Rome, claiming that supreme, absolute, and

confusionem incerta sunt, ita quam ob causam celebratum sit certo affirmari nequit.—Bin. Annot. ad Concil. Vasens. ii. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 721.]

¹ “Denique Ruffinus qui annis 400 præcessit Carolum, præfat. in recognit. Clement. a se conversas ex Græco, meminit Epistolæ Clementis ad Jacobum, et eam se vertisse dicit ex Græco. Esse autem vere hanc versionem Ruffini testatur Gennadius, Lib. de Vir. Illustr. in Ruffino.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² “Gennadius de Ruffino agens in cunctis se e Græco editis versionibus præfationem imponere testatur; adeo ut quæ sine prologo reperiuntur esse translata, non Ruffini sed alterius esse opus affirmet.”—Baron. Anno Dom. 102. num. 6. [Tom. ii. p. 13. Antv. 1617.]

³ “Horum omnium quæcunque præmissis prologis a Latinis leguntur a Ruffino interpretata sunt, quæ autem sine prologo ab alio translata sunt qui prologum facere noluit.”—Gennad. de Viris Illustr. cap. 17. [Inter Opp. Hieron. Tom. ii. col. 960.] Citat. etiam in Annot. Binii ad Epist. i. Clement. ad Jacobum. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 98.]

commanding authority over the whole Church, which we deny.

The first of the twelve is Julius the First¹, in his epistle extant in the second Apology of Athanasius. The witness is good, and we will not except against him; but he deposeth directly against them that produce him; neither is there any better evidence to be desired than this his epistle. For the

¹ “Τί γὰρ καὶ γέγονεν ἄξιον λύπης, ἢ ἐν τίνι ἦν ἄξιον λυπηθῆναι ὑμᾶς οἷς καὶ ἐγράψαμεν; ἢ ὅτι προσετρεψάμεθα εἰς σύνοδον ἀπαντῆσαι; ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἔδει μετὰ χαρᾶς δέξασθαι. Οἱ γὰρ παρρησίαν ἔχοντες ἐφ’ οἷς πεποιήκασι, καὶ ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσι κεκρίκασιν, οὐκ ἀγανακτοῦσιν, εἰ παρ’ ἐτέρων ἐξετάζοιτο ἡ κρίσις, ἀλλὰ θαρρόουσιν, ὅτι ἅ δικαίως ἐκρίνον ταῦτα ἄδिका οὐκ ἂν ποτε γένοιτο. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νίκαιαν μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ συνέλθοντες ἐπίσκοποι οὐκ ἄνευ θεοῦ βουλήσεως συνεχώρησαν ἐν ἐτέρᾳ συνόδῳ τὰ τῆς προτέρας ἐξετάζεσθαι.

“Οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν τῶν περὶ Εὐσεβίου ἀποσταλέντες μετὰ γραμμάτων, λέγω δὴ Μακάριος ὁ πρεσβύτερος καὶ Μαρτύριος καὶ Ἡσύχιος οἱ διάκονοι ἀπαντήσαντες ἐνταῦθα, ὡς οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλθόντας Ἀθανασίου πρεσβυτέρους ἀντιστῆναι, ἀλλ’ ἐν πᾶσι διετρέποντο καὶ διηλέγοντο, τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἠξίωσαν ἡμᾶς ὥστε σύνοδον συγκροτῆσαι, καὶ γράψαι καὶ Ἀθανασίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ εἰς Ἀλεξανδρείαν, γράψαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς περὶ Εὐσέβιον ἵνα ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ πάντων ἡ δικαία κρίσις ἐξενεχθῇ δυνήθῃ.

“Εἰ τοίνυν μηδὲ τῶν περὶ Μαρτύριον καὶ Ἡσύχιον ἀξιωσάντων γίνεσθαι σύνοδον προτρεψάμενος ἡμῖν ἔγω σκύλαι τοὺς γράψαντας, ἔνεκεν τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν αἰτιωμένων ἀδικίαν πεπονθέναι καὶ οὕτως εὐλογος ἦν καὶ δικαία ἡ προτροπὴ, ἔστι γὰρ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ καὶ θεῷ ἀρέσκουσα.

“Τίνες οὖν εἰσὶν οἱ σύνοδον ἀτιμάζοντες; οὐχὶ οἱ τῶν τριακοσίων τὰς ψήφους παρ’ οὐδέν θέμενοι, καὶ ἀσέβειαν εὐσεβείας προκρίναντες;

“Ἀθανάσιος δὲ ἐμαρτυρήθη μηδὲ ἐν Τύρῳ καταγνωσθεὶς, ἐν δὲ τῷ Μαρεώτῃ μὴ παρῆναι ἔνθα τὰ ὑπομνήματα κατ’ αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι λέγεται.

“Ἀθανάσιος δὲ καὶ Μάρκελλος οἱ ἐπίσκοποι πλείονας ἔχουσι τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν λέγοντας καὶ γράφοντας... Ὅμως τούτων ὄντων ἡμεῖς, ὑπὲρ ἀκριβείας, οὔτε ὑμῖν οὔτε τοῖς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γράψασιν πρόκριμα ποιῶντες προετρεψάμεθα τοὺς γράψαντας ἐλθεῖν, ἵν’ ἐπειδὴ πλείους εἰσὶν οἱ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γράψαντες ἐπὶ συνόδου πάντα ἐξετασθῇ.

“Ὅμως δὲ γνώρισαι ὑμῖν ἀναγκαῖον ὅτι εἰ καὶ μόνος ἔγραψα, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐμοῦ μόνου ἐστὶν αὕτη ἡ γνώμη, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν, καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις τοῖς μέρεσιν ἐπισκόπων.

“Ἐπίσκοποι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ πάσχοντες, καὶ οὐχ αἱ τυχοῦσαι ἐκκλησίαι αἱ πάσχουσαι, ἀλλ’ ὧν αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι δι’ ἑαυτῶν καθηγήσαντο. Διατὶ δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας μάλιστα οὐκ ἐγράφετο ἡμῖν; ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὀρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια... Οὐχ οὕτως αἱ Παύλου διατάξεις, οὐχ’ οὕτως οἱ πατέρες παραδώρασιν, ἄλλος τύπος ἐστὶν οὗτος, καὶ καινὸν τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα.”—Julii Epist. In Apolog. Athanas. [Tom. i. pp. 142, 153.]

bishops of the East having written to Julius, and blamed him for communicating with such as they rejected, and going about to reverse the acts which they had agreed on; and having told him, that the greatness of cities maketh not the power of bishops to be the greater; and that therefore he should not take on him to be greater than other bishops, and to undo that which they had done, because he was bishop of a greater city than any of them was: he answereth modestly in this his epistle, that he hopeth he offendeth not in desiring them to come to a synod, that therein their proceedings might be examined; seeing the Nicene council appointeth the acts of one council to be re-examined in another. Secondly, he showeth, that they whom they sent to inform him and the western bishops touching their proceedings against Athanasius, being convicted by the presbyters of Athanasius, desired him to call a council of his own bishops, and to write to Athanasius, and those of Eusebius' part, to come unto the same; wherein they doubted not but they should prove the things they had alleged. Thirdly, he showeth that if without the solicitation of their agents he had desired them to meet in council, it had been no fault, nor any way prejudicial unto them. Fourthly, that they who will not have their proceedings re-examined condemn councils, by admitting such as were condemned by the Nicene council; that Athanasius was not condemned at Tyrus; that he was not present when he was condemned at Mareotta; and that many wrote in his defence to him and the other bishops of the West; and that yet he forejudged nothing, but would have had matters defined in a council. Fifthly, he showeth that though he wrote alone, yet he reporteth not his own opinion only, but of all the bishops of Italy, and the countries thereabout. Lastly, he telleth them, that the bishops they proceeded against being no vulgar persons, but bishops of such Churches as the apostles themselves planted, before they had proceeded against them, they should first have written to him and his colleagues, that from thence might have been defined what was right and good; than which course what could be more fitting? For Athanasius bishop of the second see, with other his adherents, were not to be judged by bishops of an inferior rank, especially in a matter concerning the faith, without first consulting the bishop of the first see and his colleagues, that from thence an action of such consequence might

take beginning. And therefore Julius rightly telleth the oriental bishops, that in their rash proceeding against so great and worthy a bishop as was Athanasius, they had offended against the ordinations of Paul; that the fathers had not taught them so to do; and that he had received otherwise from blessed Peter. Here is nothing found, for any thing I see, that any way proveth the pope to have a supreme commanding power over the whole Church; but rather the contrary. For he doth nothing without the synod of the western bishops; he challengeth not the right of judging the causes of the oriental bishops, either by himself alone, or with his synod of western bishops; much less deriveth the claim of any such right from Peter; as the Jesuit untruly misreporteth the matter; but thinketh that the final and supreme judging of them pertaineth to a general council.

The next allegation is out of an epistle of Damasus¹, wherein writing to the bishops of the East, he commendeth them that they gave due reverence to the see apostolic, and calleth them sons. To what purpose this allegation serveth, I know not. For if any man do think it consequent, that the pope hath an universal commanding power over all, because the bishops of the East yielded a kind of due respect and reverence to the see apostolic, (that is, to the bishop of Rome, and his colleagues,) for that it was in order and honour the first see; he is greatly deceived, and may be confuted out of the epistle of the oriental bishops², in answer whereof Damasus writeth. For they write unto him, not as to their lord and commander, but as to their brother and colleague; and direct not their letters to him only, but to him and the other bishops of the West. Their epistle beginneth in this sort: "To their brethren and colleagues, Damasus, Ambrose, Brito, Valerianus, Ascholius, &c., and the rest of the holy bishops assembled in the great city of Rome." Where, by the way, we may observe, that howsoever Damasus call them sons, as being bishops

¹ "Ὅτι τῇ ἀποστολικῇ καθέδρᾳ τὴν ὀφειλομένην αἰδῶ ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ἀπονέμει, ἑαυτοῖς τὸ πλεῖστον παρέχετε, υἱοὶ τιμιώτατοι."—Epist. Damas. Apud Theodoret. H. E. v. 9. [Al. 10.]

² "Κυρίοις τιμιωτάτοις καὶ εὐλαβεστάτοις ἀδελφοῖς καὶ συλλειτουργοῖς Δαμάσῳ, Ἀμβροσίῳ, Βρίττῳ, Οὐαλεριανῷ, Ἀσχολίῳ, Ἀνεμίῳ, Βασιλείῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἁγίοις ἐπισκόποις τοῖς συνεληλυθόσιν ἐν τῇ μεγαλοπόλει Ῥώμῃ."—Apud Theodoret. [v. 9.]

of meaner places, and inferior sees, yet they call him brother and colleague, as being equal in office and power, though inferior in order and honour. Besides this, they refused to come to Rome, though earnestly entreated by Damasus so to do, but stayed at Constantinople, and there held a council, wherein they condemned the heresies of the Eunomians and Macedonians; ordained sundry bishops, as the bishops of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem, Nectarius, Flavianus, and Cyril; they made the bishop of Constantinople a patriarch, and set him in degree of honour next unto the bishop of Rome¹. These ordinations of Nectarius and Flavianus especially Damasus liked not, and yet was forced to give way unto them, and to yield to the bishops assembled at Constantinople (being but an hundred and fifty in number) the name of the general council; though about the same time he and all the bishops of the West were assembled at Rome; wherefore this testimony might well have been spared. The next allegation out of the epistle of Damasus² to the bishops of Numidia, is less to be esteemed than the former; seeing that epistle hath many things in it which cannot agree with the state of things in those times. For if the Africans had been so willing to refer all greater matters by way of appeal to Rome, as the epistle of Stephen, in answer whereunto this of Damasus is written, importeth; how could it have come to pass that in Zosimus his time appeals to Rome should seem so strange as it appeareth they did?

That which is alleged out of the epistle of Siricius to Himericus³ bishop of Tarracon, and of Zosimus to Hesychius bishop of Salona⁴, is to little purpose; for that Siricius saith,

¹ Vide notas Binii in Concil. Constantin. i. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 1151.]

² "Cuncta quæ possunt aliquam recipere dubitationem ad nos tanquam ad caput, ut semper fuit consuetudo, deferre non desinatis."—Epist. Damasi ad Episc. Numid. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 1025.]

³ "Portamus onera omnium qui gravantur. Quinimo hoc portat in vobis B. apostolus Petrus, qui nos in omnibus, ut confidimus, administrationis suæ protegit, et tuetur hæredes.

"Explicavimus, ut arbitror, frater carissime, universa quæ digesta sunt in querelam, et ad singulas causas de quibus per filium nostrum Bassianum presbyterum ad Romanam ecclesiam, utpote ad caput tui corporis retulisti, &c."—Epist. Siricii ad Himericum Episc. Tarracon. [Labbe, Tom. ii. coll. 1213, 7.]

⁴ "Ad te potissimum scripta direximus, quæ in omnium fratrum et

he is more zealous of true religion than all other Christians, and that he beareth the burthen of all that are grieved, is no more than is attributed to Athanasius bishop of Alexandria¹. Neither is it to be marvelled at, that he saith, the bishop of Tarracon referred certain matters to the Church of Rome, as to the head of his body, seeing he was one of the bishops that were subject to the bishop of Rome, as patriarch of the West. Which also is the reason why Zosimus giveth directions to the bishop of Salona touching the time they of the clergy were to continue in every of the lower degrees, before they might be preferred to higher, wishing him to acquaint others near unto him with the same, and to assure them that he should answer it with the loss of his place, whosoever should contemn the authority of the fathers, and neglect his prescriptions.

The next pope that is produced as a witness is Innocentius the First², in his epistles to the bishops of Macedonia, and the fathers assembled in the councils of Milevis and Carthage³, out of which epistles four things are alleged for proof of the pope's supremacy. The first is, that the Church of Rome is by him called head of Churches, yea, the wellspring and head

episcoporum nostrorum facies ire notitiam. . . . Sciet quisquis hoc, post posita patrum et apostolicæ sedis auctoritate neglexerit, a nobis distractius vindicandum, ut loci sui minime dubitet sibi non constare rationem si hoc putat post tot prohibitiones posse tentari."—Epist. Zosimi ad Hesych. Episc. Salon. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 400.]

¹ "Οὐδένα τοσοῦτον ἡγοῦμαι λυπεῖν τὴν παροῦσαν τῶν ἐκκλησίῳν κατάστασιν, μᾶλλον δὲ σύγχυσιν, εἰπεῖν ἀληθέστερον, ὅσον τὴν σὴν τιμιότητα. . . . Ὅτι ὀφείλεις, κατὰ τοὺς σοφωτάτους τῶν ἱατρῶν, τῆς ἐπιμελείας ἐκ τῶν καιριωτάτων ἄρχεσθαι, πάντος ἀκριβέστερον αὐτὸς ἐπίστασαι. Τί δ' ἂν γένοιτο ταῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἐπικαιριώτερον;"—Basil. Epist. xlviii. [Al. lxvi. Tom. III. p. 158.]

² "Adverti sedi apostolicæ ad quam relatio quasi ad caput ecclesiarum missa currebat, fieri injuriam, &c."—Innocent. Epist. xxii. ad Episc. Maced. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 32.]

³ "Diligenter et congrue apostolico consulitis honori. Honori, inquam, illius quem præter illa quæ extrinsecus sunt sollicitudo manet omnium ecclesiarum; antiquæ scilicet regulæ formam secuti, quam toto semper ab orbe mecum nostis esse servatum."—Id. Inter Epist. August. xciii. [Al. clxxxii. Tom. II. col. 639.]

"Ad nostrum referendum approbastis esse judicium, scientes quid apostolicæ sedi, cum omnes hoc loco positi ipsum sequi desideremus apostolum, debeatur, a quo ipse episcopatus et tota auctoritas nominis hujus emersit."—Id. Epist. xci. [Al. clxxxi. col. 635.]

of all Churches. The second, that doubtful cases were referred to the see of Rome by the bishops of Macedonia. The third, that all the bishops of the world were wont to consult the Roman bishop, in doubtful questions touching matters of faith. The fourth, that the Roman bishops have the care of all Churches. To these several objections, framed out of the epistles of this Roman bishop, we answer briefly: first, that the Church of Rome was head of all Churches; that is, first in order and honour amongst them, but not in absolute supreme commanding power. Secondly, that the Church of Rome was in more special sort head of such Churches as were within the patriarchship of Rome (as Macedonia was in Innocentius his time); and that this was the reason why the bishops of Macedonia referred their doubts to the determination of the see of Rome. Thirdly, that all the bishops of the world consulted the apostolic see of Rome, and the bishop thereof, in controversies of faith and religion, not as an absolute supreme judge, to whose determinations they were bound to stand, but as their most honourable colleague, interested as much as any of them in the maintenance of the truth of religion, and the determination of things questioned concerning the faith. Fourthly, that they did not consult the person of the bishop of Rome alone, but all the bishops of the West together with him, who were a great and principal part of the Christian world, though sometimes he only be named, as being the president of all the synods of bishops throughout the West. Fifthly, that the bishops of Rome had the care of all Churches, not as absolute supreme commanders, but as most honourable amongst the bishops and pastors of Churches; who were first to be sought unto in matters requiring a common deliberation, and from whom all things generally concerning the state of the whole Church were either to take beginning, or at the least to seek confirmation before they were generally imposed and prescribed; that so being rightly determined by the bishops of the chief and principal Churches, other Churches might receive the same, like waters flowing from a fountain, and running in purity in all Churches, according to the purity of the head and beginning.

The sixth bishop of Rome that is produced to give testimony for the pope's supremacy is Leo the First, out of whom seven things are alleged: whereof the first is, that he ap-

pointed Anastasius¹, the bishop of Thessalonica, to be his vicerent for the government of the provinces far off from him: whence it may be inferred, as our adversaries think, that the bishops of Rome had an universal commanding power over all the world. The second, that he commandeth Anatolius² patriarch of Constantinople. The third, that he wisheth the bishop of Antioch³ to write often to him touching the affairs and state of the Churches. The fourth, that Cyril⁴, the patriarch of Alexandria, besought him not to permit Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, to prejudice the right of the Church of Antioch, and to subject Palestina to himself. The fifth, that he commanded Dioscorus⁵ bishop of Alexandria. The sixth, that he

¹ "Sicut præcessores mei præcessoribus tuis, ita etiam ego dilectioni tuæ priorum secutus exemplum vices mei moderaminis delegavi, ut curam quam universis ecclesiis principaliter ex divina institutione debemus imitator nostræ mansuetudinis adjuvares, et longinquis a nobis provinciis præsentiam quodammodo nostræ visitationis impenderes."—Leo, Epist. lxxxiv. [Al. xiv. ad Anastasium, Tom. i. col. 683.]

² "Hanc regulam mementote servandam, ut quicumque in illa synodo quæ nomen synodi nec habere poterit nec meretur et in qua malevolentiam suam Dioscorus, imperitiam autem Juvenalis ostendit, dolent, ut dilectionis tuæ relatione comperimus, se metu victos, et terrore superatos ad consensum scelestissimi judicii potuisse compelli, et communionem catholicam obtinere desiderant, satisfactioni eorum pax fraterna præstetur; ita ut non dubiis professionibus Eutychen cum suo dogmate cumque consortibus suis anathematis execratione condemnent."—Epist. xlv. [Al. lxxxv. ad Anatolium Episcopum Constantinopolitanum, col. 1051.]

³ "Cum aliquid pro Antiochenæ ecclesiæ privilegiis dilectio tua agendum esse crediderit, propriis litteris studeat explicare, ut nos consultationi tuæ absolute et congrue respondere possimus."—Epist. lxii. [Al. cxix. ad Maximum Antiochenum Episcopum, col. 1214.]

⁴ "In Ephesina synodo quæ impium Nestorium cum dogmate suo perculit Juvenalis episcopus ad obtinendum Palestinæ provinciæ principatum credidit se posse proficere, et insolentes ausus per commentitia scripta firmare. Quod sanctæ memoriæ Cyrillus Alexandrinus episcopus merito perhorrescens scriptis suis mihi quid prædicti cupiditas ausa esset indicavit; et sollicita prece multum poposcit, ut nulla illicitis conatibus præberetur assensio."—Ibid. [col. 1216.]

⁵ "Cum beatissimus Petrus apostolicum a Domino acceperit principatum, et Romana in ejus permaneat institutis, nefas est credere quod sanctus discipulus ejus Marcus qui Alexandrinam primus ecclesiam gubernaverit aliis regulis traditionum suarum decreta formaverit; cum sine dubio de eodem fonte gratiæ unus spiritus et discipuli fuerit et magistri, nec aliud ordinatus tradere potuerit quam quod ab ordinatore

intermeddled in Africa¹. And the last, that he saith, that Rome² had a larger extent of precedence, in that by Peter's chair she was made the head of all Churches, than in that in respect of earthly dominion she was lady and mistress of a great part of the world. To all these objections, thus mustered together out of the writings of Leo, we answer in this sort. First, that Thessalonica was within the patriarchship of Rome, and that therefore the bishop of Rome might have a vicegerent there, to despatch some of those things that pertained to him as patriarch, and yet have no universal commanding power over all the world. Secondly, we say, that Leo did not acknowledge Anatolius bishop of Constantinople to be a patriarch, and that therefore it followeth not, that he would have presumed to have commanded a patriarch, if he had commanded him; but that indeed he did not command him. For thus the case stood³. After the council of Ephesus, wherein divers bishops, compelled by Dioscorus, subscribed to impious decrees, Leo besought the emperor that a general council might be called; but because by reason of wars in many parts of the world, such a council could not conveniently be presently called, he sent certain commissioners to Constantinople, who taking to them the bishop of Constantinople, and being assisted by him and the bishops thereabout, might, upon repentance and due satisfaction, reconcile and again admit to the communion of their Churches such as they

suscepit. Non ergo patimur, ut cum unius nos esse corporis et fidei fateamur, in aliquo discrepemus; et alia doctoris, alia discipuli instituta videantur."—Epist. lxxxi. [Al. ix. ad Dioscorum, col. 628.]

¹ "Cum de ordinationis sacerdotum quædam apud vos illicite usurpata crebrior ad nos commeantium sermo perferret, ratio pietatis exegit ut pro sollicitudine quam universæ ecclesiæ ex divina institutione dependimus rerum fidem studeremus agnoscere, &c.

"Causam quoque Lupicini episcopi illic jubemus audiri, cui multum et sæpius postulanti communionem hac ratione reddidimus, quoniam cum ad nostram judicium provocasset, immerito eum pendente negotio a communione videbamus fuisse suspensum, &c."—Epist. lxxxvii. [Al. xii. coll. 658, 668.]

² "Isti sunt [præcipui apostoli] qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt, ut gens sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia, per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsideres religione divina quam dominatione terrena."—Serm. i. In Natal. Apost. [Serm. lxxxii. Tom. i. col. 321.]

³ Vid. Epist. xlvi. Leonis. [Citat. p. 290, not. 2.]

should think fit. These commissioners Leo directed and commanded, as in right he might: but that he specially commanded the bishop of Constantinople, it cannot be proved. Thirdly, we say, that Leo in brotherly sort wished the bishop of Antioch to resist heretics; and to let him understand of the state of the Churches, and to be a consort of the apostolic see in this care: to see that the privileges of the third see were not diminished by any man's ambition, assuring him, that whensoever he will do any thing for the advancing of the dignity of the see of Antioch, he also will be ready to concur with him. In all which passages between Leo and the bishop of Antioch there is nothing found that hath any show of proof of the pope's supremacy. Fourthly, we say that Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, besought Leo to give no consent to the attempts of Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, seeking to prejudice the Church of Antioch, and to subject Palestina to himself: but that he besought Leo not to permit nor suffer Palestina to be taken from Antioch, and subjected to the Church of Jerusalem (as if the whole power of permitting or hindering this thing had rested in Leo), is but the false report of the cardinal, according to his wonted manner of misalleging authors for the advantage of his cause. So that the disposition of this matter rested not wholly in Leo, but his concurrence with the bishops of Antioch and Alexandria was necessary for the withstanding of the attempts of Juvenal; which his concurrence and help he promised the bishop of Antioch, as we have already heard, and was ever ready to yield the same unto him. Fifthly, we say that Leo did not command Dioscorus the patriarch of Alexandria; but whereas the manner was, when the patriarchs were first elected and ordained, that they should mutually consent one to another, and that he who was newly ordained should send unto the rest his synodal letters, and testimonies of his lawful election and ordination; Dioscorus being newly elected and appointed patriarch of Alexandria, sendeth his synodal letters to Leo bishop of Rome, that so he might give his consent, and receive and embrace him as his fellow-patriarch. Leo, that these beginnings of Dioscorus might be more sure and firm, and nothing wanting to perfection, fatherly, as more ancient, and brotherly, as of the same rank with him, putting him in mind of some differences between their two Churches, about the time of the ordination

of ministers; and for that it seemed not likely unto him, that Mark the scholar of Peter took any other order in this behalf than Peter did, said unto him: "We will have you to observe that which our fathers ever observed;" making this a condition of the allowance and consent he was to yield unto him; and urging the practice of the apostles, saith, he shall do well, if, obeying these apostolical institutions, he shall cause that form of ordination to be kept in the Churches over which God hath set him, which is observed in the Churches of the West, that ministers of the Church may be ordained only on the Lord's day, on which day the creation of the world was begun, in which Christ rose, in which death was destroyed, and life, after which there is no death, took beginning; in which the apostles received from the Lord the trumpet of preaching the gospel, and the ministration of the sacrament of regeneration. Sixthly, we say, that Leo intermeddled in the Churches of Africa, and requireth some ordained contrary to the canons to be put from their places, tolerateth others, and willet the cause of Lupicinus, a bishop who had appealed unto him, to be heard there, because he was patriarch of the West, and these parts of Africa were within his patriarchship; and that yet this his intermeddling in so particular sort with the affairs of the African Churches, was not very pleasing unto those of Africa, as shall appear by that which followeth. Lastly, we say that the Church of Rome was the head of all Churches in the sense before expressed, and had a precedence of order and honour amongst them; and had in that sort, as Leo truly saith, more subject to it than ever were under the Roman empire: but under any absolute, supreme, commanding power of the Church of Rome, they were not. "But," saith Bellarmine, "if the former testimonies of Leo be avoided, there is one more yet behind so clear and full for the supremacy of the pope, that nothing can be said in answer unto it, in his epistle to Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica." His words are these: "Amongst the most blessed apostles, like in honour, there was a certain difference and distinction of power; and whereas they were equally chosen, yet notwithstanding it was given to one of them to have a pre-eminence amongst the rest; from which form the distinction and difference that is amongst bishops hath taken beginning; and by a most wise disposition it hath been provided, that all without difference shall not

challenge all unto themselves, but that there should be in several provinces several bishops, whose sentence and judgments should be first and chief amongst the brethren; and again, certain other constituted and placed in greater cities, who might take the care of more than the former, by whom the care of the whole Church might flow unto that one seat of Peter, and nothing anywhere might dissent from the head¹." These words truly make a goodly show, and may seem most strongly to prove the supremacy that the popes now challenge: but in very deed they most powerfully overthrow it. For the bishops of Rome will never be persuaded in proportionable sort as is expressed in the words of Leo, to challenge no more in respect of the whole Church than the metropolitan bishops do in respect of their provinces, and the patriarchs in respect of their Churches of a larger extent: for then they must do nothing but accordingly as they shall be swayed by the major part of the voices of the bishops of the Christian Church. For the metropolitan may do nothing in his province, nor the patriarch in his larger extent, but as they shall be directed and swayed by the major part of the voices of their bishops: and yet surely the meaning of Leo was not to give so much to the bishop of Rome, in respect of all Christian bishops, as pertaineth to the metropolitans and patriarchs in respect of their bishops. For the metropolitan is to ordain the bishops of the province, and the patriarch to ordain and confirm the metropolitans by imposition of hands, or mission of the pall: but the pope never had any such power in respect of the patriarchs, who were only to send their synodal epistles to him testifying their faith, as he likewise to them, without expecting any other confirmation than that mutual consent, whereby one of them assured of the right faith and lawful ordination of another, received and embraced each other as fellows and colleagues. So that that care of the universal Church, which

¹ "Inter beatissimos apostolos in similitudine honoris fuit quædam discretio potestatis; et cum omnium par esset electio, uni tamen datum est ut cæteris præemineret. De qua forma episcoporum quoque est orta distinctio; et magna ordinatione provisum est, ne omnes sibi omnia vindicarent, sed essent in singulis provinciis singuli quorum inter fratres haberetur prima sententia; et rursus quidam in majoribus urbibus constituti sollicitudinem susciperent ampliorem, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis ecclesiæ cura conflueret, et nihil usquam a suo capite dissideret."—Epist. lxxxiv. [Al. xiv. col. 691.]

Leo saith floweth together, and cometh up to that one chair of Peter, is to be understood only in respect of things concerning the common faith, and general state of the Church; or of the principal, most eminent, and highest parts and members of the same: none of which things might be proceeded in without the bishop of Rome and his colleagues: but otherwise he was not to intermeddle with inferior persons and causes, within the jurisdiction of other patriarchs, neither immediately, nor upon appeal and complaint.

The seventh Roman bishop brought to testify for the absolute supreme power of popes, is Gelasius: out of whom two things are alleged. The first is, that he saith¹, the see of Peter hath power to loose that which the bishops of other Churches have bound. The second², that it hath power to judge of every Church, and that no Church may judge of the judgment of it. For answer to this testimony of Gelasius, first we say, that the Church of Rome may not meddle with reviewing, re-examining, or reversing the acts of other Churches, proceeding against laymen or inferior clergymen. Secondly, that in the case of a bishop complaining of wrong, by the authority of the council of Sardica³, she might interpose herself, not so as to bring the matter to Rome, there to be heard; but so far forth only as to command and appoint a review to be taken by the bishops of the next bordering province, or at the most to send some commissioners to sit with such second judges. Thirdly, that in cases which con-

¹ "Cuncta per mundum novit ecclesia quoniam quorumlibet sententiis ligata pontificum sedes Beati Petri apostoli jus habeat resolvendi. Utpote quæ de omni ecclesia fas habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare judicio."—Gelas. Epist. ad Episc. Dardan. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 328.]

² "Apostolicæ sedis auctoritas, quæ cunctis sæculis Christianis prælata sit universæ, et canonum serie paternorum et multiplici ratione firmatur."—Id. Epist. ad Anastas. Imper. [col. 311.]

³ "Ἦρεσεν ἰν' εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος καταγγελλεῖη, καὶ συναθροισθέντες οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τῆς ἐνορίας τῆς αὐτῆς τοῦ βαθμοῦ αὐτὸν ἀποκινήσωσι, καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκκαλεσάμενος καταφύγῃ ἐπὶ τὸν μακαριώτατον τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ βουλευθείη αὐτοῦ διακοῦσαι, δίκαιόν τε εἶναι νομίση ἀνανεώσασθαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξέτασιν τοῦ πράγματος, γράφειν τούτοις τοῖς συνεπισκόποις καταξιώση, τοῖς ἀγγιστεύουσι τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ, ἵνα αὐτοὶ ἐπιμελῶς καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἕκαστα διερευνήσωσι, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας πίστιν ψῆφον περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἐξενέγκωσιν."—Conc. Sardic. can. v. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 660.]

cerned the principal patriarchs, whether they were differences between them and their bishops, or between themselves, the chief see, as the principal part of the whole Church, might interpose itself. Neither was this proper to the see of Rome: for other patriarchs likewise of the higher thrones might interpose themselves in matters concerning the patriarchs of inferior thrones: whence it is that Basil writing to Athanasius, bishop of the second see¹, telleth him that the ordering of the Church of Antioch, which was the third see, did pertain to him, and that he was to see to the settling of things there, though the quieting of the whole East required the help of the occidental bishops: and Cyril², in the case of Nestorius not yet fully established, in the right of a patriarch inter-meddled, and proceeded so far as to reject him and his adherents from the communion of the Churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. But the bishop of the inferior thrones might not judge the superior: and therefore John of Antioch³, of the third see, is reprehended and reprov'd for judging Cyril bishop of the second see; and Dioscorus, bishop of the second see, is condemned in the council of Chalcedon⁴, as for other things, so for this among other, that he presumed to judge

¹ “Πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἴσως σοι καὶ πλείονων συνεργίας προσδεῖ, καὶ ἀνάγκη ἀναμένειν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς δύσεως. Ἡ μέντοι τῆς κατὰ Ἀντιοχείαν ἐκκλησίας εὐταξία, προδήλως τῆς σῆς ἡρτηται θεοσεβείας.”—Basil. Epist. xlviii. [Al. lxvi. Tom. iii. p. 158.]

² “Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς τοίνυν παρ’ αὐτοῦ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὥρισε διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἀγιωτάτης συνόδου ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τοῦ ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος, καὶ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱερατικοῦ.”—Concil. Ephes. [Act. i. Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1077.]

³ “Συνάπτει καταμόνας χαρτίον, καὶ δὴ καθαιρέσεως ὄνομα καὶ ὕβριν προσετρίψατο τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπισκόπῳ Κυρίλλῳ, κ.τ.λ.”—Ibid. [col. 1193.]

⁴ “Quoniam super alias suas nequitias et adversus ipsam apostolicam sedem latravit, et excommunicationis literas adversus sanctissimum et beatissimum papam Leonem facere conatus est, &c.”—Epist. Concil. Chalced. ad Marcian. et Valentin. Act. iii. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1352.]

“Οὗτος ὁ ἀγιώτατος, μᾶλλον δὲ εἰπεῖν, ἀγριώτατος, περὶ πάντα ἐν ἔξει γενόμενος τοῦ παρανομεῖν, οὐδὲν ἡγησάμενος τὸ παρ’ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας καὶ ἀγίας μνήμης Φλανιανοῦ τολμηθὲν, ἐπὶ μείζον τὸ κακὸν τρέπεται. Ἀκοινωνησίαν κατὰ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ ὁσιωτάτου ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης παρασκευάζει.”—Epist. alt. ad Leonem. Act. iii. Concil. ejusd. [col. 1272.]

the first see. So that this is it which Gelasius saith, that the see of Rome, that is, the bishop of Rome, and the bishops of the West, may judge and examine the differences between patriarchs, or between patriarchs and their bishops; but neither so peremptorily nor finally, but that such judgment may be reviewed and re-examined in a general council: and that no other particular Church or see may judge the Church of Rome, seeing every other see is inferior to it; no way denying but that a general council may review, re-examine, and reverse the acts and judgments of the Roman see, as being greater, and of more ample authority. Neither truly can there be any better proof against the pretended supremacy of the popes than this epistle, the circumstances whereof are these. Acatius, bishop of Constantinople, for communicating with certain Eutychian heretics, was by the see of Rome condemned: some disliked his proceeding against him, because a synod was not specially summoned for the purpose, especially seeing he was bishop of the princely city: Gelasius standeth not upon the claim of universal power, thereby to justify his proceeding, but answereth, first, that Eutyches being condemned in the council of Chalcedon, all such were accursed likewise as should either by defence of such error, or communicating with men so erring, fall into the fellowship of the same heresy, and that therefore there needed no synod, but the see apostolic might execute that was there decreed: secondly, that the catholic bishops in the East being deposed, and heretics thrust into their places, there was no reason why he should have consulted with them: thirdly, that he did nothing of himself, but with a synod of the western bishops.

The next four bishops produced by the cardinal, are John the Second, Anastasius the Second, Felix the Fourth, and Pelagius the Second; out of whom he allegeth nothing but this, that the see of Peter holdeth the chieftly assigned of the Lord in the universal Church, and that the Church of Rome is the head of all Churches. Whereunto we briefly answer, that the see of Peter ever held the chieftly, and that the Church of Rome was ever the head of all Churches, not in universality of absolute supreme power and commanding authority, but in order and honour in sort before expressed: and that by the see of Peter and Church of Rome is meant the whole West Church, and not precisely the diocese of Rome, as likewise we

have noted before : and therefore these allegations to prove the pope's supremacy over all bishops, are nothing to the purpose.

The last of the twelve bishops brought by Bellarmine, is Gregory the First; out of whom four things are alleged. The first is¹, that he required the Africans to permit appeals to Rome from the council of Numidia, and blamed the bishops of Africa, for that after letters written unto them they had degraded Honoratus the archdeacon. The second², that he sent a pall to the bishop of Corinth. The third³, that he saith, Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, acknowledged the Church of Constantinople to be subject to the see apostolic. The fourth⁴, that the bishop of Constantinople professeth his subjection to the see apostolic. To these objections we answer, first⁵, that it is contrary to the resolution of the ancient councils of Carthage and Milevis, that the bishop of Rome should admit appeals of inferior clergymen out of Africa; and that therefore by some positive constitution or later agreement, Gregory might be permitted to hear the complaints of an archdeacon appealing unto him out of Africa, yet from the beginning it was not so, though some parts of Africa were ever within the compass of the patriarchship of Rome. Secondly, that he sent the pall to the bishop of Corinth,

¹ "Ex concilio Numidiæ, si qui desiderarint ad apostolicam sedem venire, permittite; et quilibet eorum viæ contradicere voluerit, obviat."—Greg. Lib. i. Epist. lxii. [Al. lxxiv. Tom. ii. col. 559.]

² "Postquam ad beatitudinem vestram et decessoris mei et mea in causa Honorati archidiaconi, scripta directa sunt, tunc contempta utriusque sententia præfatus Honoratus proprio gradu privatus est. Quod si quilibet ex quatuor patriarchis fecisset, sine gravissimo scandalo tanta contumacia transire nullo modo potuisset."—Id. Lib. ii. Epist. xxxvii. [Al. lii. col. 618.]

³ "Pallium Joanni fratri nostro Corinthiorum episcopo nos transmississe cognoscite, cui nos magnopere decet obedire."—Id. Lib. iv. Epist. lvi. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. lviii. col. 790.]

⁴ "De Constantinopolitana ecclesia quod dicunt, quis eam dubitet sedi apostolicæ esse subjectam; quod et piissimus dominus imperator et frater noster ejusdem civitatis episcopus assidue profitetur."—Id. Lib. vii. Epist. lxiv. [Al. Lib. ix. Epist. xii. col. 941.]

"Quod se dicit sedi apostolicæ subjici; si qua culpa in episcopis invenitur, nescio quis ei episcopus subjectus non sit. Cum vero culpa non exigit, omnes secundum rationem æquales sunt."—Id. Lib. vii. Epist. lxv. [Al. Lib. ix. Epist. lix. col. 976.]

⁵ Vide infra, chap. 39. Of Appeals to Rome.

because he was within his patriarchship; all patriarchs being to confirm their metropolitans by imposition of hands, or by sending the pall. Thirdly, that there was no such Eusebius bishop of Constantinople in Gregory's time as is mentioned in the epistle alleged; and that they that were, as John and Cyriacus, strove and contended with Gregory to be above him, and to have the first place in the Church, and that not without the help and furtherance of the emperor: so that it may be doubted whether Gregory wrote this or not, it being so contrary to that we know to have been attempted and sought by the bishops of Constantinople that lived in his time. But granting that Gregory did so write, and that Eusebius, a bishop of Constantinople, did acknowledge his Church to be subject to the see of Rome, yet he meant nothing else thereby but that it was an inferior see, and so subject in such sort as I have declared the inferior sees to be subject to the superior; which subjection will no way prove the supremacy that the popes now claim. Fourthly, that Gregory doth not say that the bishop of Constantinople acknowledged himself subject to the bishop of Rome: for it was not *primas Byzanzenus*, the primate of Byzantium, that Gregory reporteth to have confess himself subject to the bishop of Rome, and whose cause the emperor commanded Gregory to hear, but *primas Byzanzenus*¹, that is, the primate of the Byzazene province of Africa. So that this confession of the primate mentioned by Gregory, brought to prove that the bishop of Rome had a commanding power over the bishop of Constantinople, is merely mistaken by Bellarmine, as it was before him by Gratian. But some man will say, Howsoever there be a mistaking of this allegation, yet it is strong and forcible to prove the thing intended; for Gregory saith expressly, that howsoever all bishops in respect of humility be equal, yet there is no bishop but if he be found faulty is subject to the see of Rome. That this saying of Gregory may be found true, certain limitations must be added unto it. For the bishop of Rome might not immediately punish every bishop that he found to offend, nor upon appeal take notice of the faults and misdemeanours of all bishops; but the council of

¹ In Epist. lxiv. agitur de primate Byzanceno provinciae Africæ.—Annot. in Gratian. Decret. Part. i. Dist. xxii. cap. 5. [col. 125, Par: 1585.]

Chalcedon¹ ordereth, that if any inferior clergyman have aught against another inferior clerk, the matter shall be heard and determined by the bishop, or such as with the liking of the bishop shall by the parties be chosen arbitrators; and if he go against their determination, he shall be punished. If a clerk have aught against his own or another bishop, it shall be inquired of in the audience of the synod of the province; if either clerk or bishop have aught against the metropolitan of the province, he shall go to the primate of the diocese, or to the throne and see of the regal city of Constantinople. This canon of the great council of Chalcedon was confirmed by the decree of Justinian the emperor. "If any man," saith the emperor², "accuse a bishop, for whatsoever cause, let the cause be judged by the metropolitan; and if any man gainsay the metropolitan, let the matter be referred to the archbishop, and patriarch of that diocese, and let him end it according to the canons and laws." So that we see the bishops of Rome might not intermeddle in judging inferior bishops, subject to other patriarchs, neither immediately, nor upon complaint and appeal, whatsoever their faults be: but they have other supreme judges, who have power finally to determine such matters, and from whom there lieth no appeal. This canon of the council of Chalcedon, and the emperor's decree confirming the same, Gregory³ allegeth and alloweth,

¹ "Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχοι, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκείον ἐπίσκοπον καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια κατατρεχέτω· ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὴν ὑπόθεσιν γυμναζέτω παρὰ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἥγουν γνώμη αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου παρ' οἷς ἂν τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν μέρη βούλεται, τὰ τῆς δίκης συγκροτεῖσθω. Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσαι, κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις. Εἰ δέ καὶ κληρικὸς ἔχοι πρᾶγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω. Εἰ δέ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίη, καταλαβανέτω ἢ τὸν ἑξάρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω."—Concil. Chalced. can. ix. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1685.]

² "Si a clero aut alio quocunque aditio contra episcopum fiat propter quamlibet causam, apud sanctissimum ejus metropolitam secundum canones et leges huic præbeat finem. Si vero contra metropolitam talis aditio fiat ab episcopo, aut clero, aut alia quacunque persona, dioceseos illius beatissimus patriarcha simili modo causam judicet."—Justinian. Novell. cxxiii. cap. 22. [Ad calc. Gothofred. Corp. Jur. Civil. p. 173, Amst. 1663.]

³ "Contra hæc si dictum fuerit quia nec metropolitam habuit nec

only adding, that if there be no metropolitan or patriarch, such things as otherwise should be finally determined and ended by them are to be brought to the bishop of Rome: wherefore it seemeth that Gregory speaketh of the bishops within his own patriarchship, whom sometimes he calleth his own bishops, when he saith there is no bishop but if he be found faulty is subject to the see of Rome. Of these he speaketh when he saith¹, "I impute it to my sins that my own bishops should thus despise me." And again: "If the causes of bishops committed to me be thus dealt with, alas what shall I do?" And in this sense he willeth John of Palermo², to whom he sendeth a pall, not to suffer the reverence of the apostolic see to be troubled by any man's presumption: for that the state of the members is then entire and safe, when the canons are kept, and no injury hurteth the head of the faith: not naming the Church of Rome the head of the faith, for that the bishop of Rome hath an infallible judgment, and absolute command in matters of faith, upon which all the world must depend (as some ignorantly construe him), but because it was the head, that is, the beginning and wellspring, whence the doctrine of faith, the knowledge of God, and all Christian institution flowed to sundry other Churches; which therefore are in a sort to depend on it, to have recourse to it, and to hold conformity with it. "No other," saith Innocentius³, "established and founded the

patriarcham, dicendum est quia a sede apostolica, quæ omnium ecclesiarum caput est, causa hæc audienda ac dirimenda fuerat."—Greg. Lib. xi. Epist. liv. [Al. Lib. xiii. Epist. xlv. Tom. ii. col. 1254.]

¹ "Ut episcopi mei me despiciant, et contra me refugium ad seculares judices habeant, omnipotenti Deo gratias ago, peccatis meis deputo."—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxiv. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xxi. Tom. ii. col. 752.] Et in Epist. xxxvi. hortatur Eulogium episc. Alexandr. et Anastasium Antiochenum ut omnes episcopos eorum curæ subjectos ab iniquitate elationis episc. Constantinopolitani prohibeant.—[Al. Lib. v. Epist. xliii. col. 773.]

² "Illud admonemus ut apostolicæ sedis reverentia nullius præsumptione turbetur. Tunc enim status membrorum integer manet, si caput fidei nulla pulset injuria, et canonum maneat incolumis atque intemerata semper auctoritas."—Lib. xi. Epist. xlii. [Leg. xxiv. Al. Lib. xiii. Epist. xxxvi. col. 1244.]

³ "Præsertim cum sit manifestum in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam, insulasque interjacentes, nullum instituisse ecclesias, nisi eos quos venerabilis apostolus Petrus aut ejus

Churches of Italy, France, Germany, Spain, Africk, and the isles that lie between, but Peter and his successors: and therefore the bishops of these Churches must keep such observations as the Roman Church (from which they took their beginning) received from the apostles, *ne caput institutionum omittere videantur*, that is, 'lest they seem to forsake the head and wellspring of all the institutions and ordinances they have.' This is the reason why the Churches of these parts have been so subject to the Church of Rome, namely, for that from thence they received the light of Christian knowledge; but to all Churches it is not an head in this sort, seeing they received the faith not from Rome, but from some other apostolical Church, as Antioch, or Alexandria."

CHAPTER XXXV.

OF THE PRETENDED PROOFS OF THE POPE'S SUPREMACY PRODUCED AND BROUGHT OUT OF THE WRITINGS OF THE GREEK FATHERS.

HAVING examined the proofs they bring for confirmation of the pope's supremacy out of councils, and the writings of ancient bishops of Rome, let us come to the testimonies of the fathers Greek and Latin.

The first that they produce amongst Greek fathers is Ignatius¹, who writeth to the holy Church which hath the precedence in the region of the Romans, or sitteth before other in the region of the Romans; from which words nothing can be inferred that we ever doubted of. For we most willingly confess the Roman Church to have been in order

successores constituerint sacerdotes. Aut legant, si in his provinciis alius apostolorum invenitur aut legitur docuisse. Quod si non legunt, quia nusquam invenitur, oportet eos hoc sequi quod ecclesia Romana custodit, a qua eos principium accepisse non dubium est; ne dum peregrinis assertionibus student, caput institutionum videantur omittere."—Innocent. Epist. ad Decentium Eugubinum. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 4.]

¹ "Ἡτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων."—Ignat. ad Romanos. [Coteler. Patr. Apost. Tom. II. p. 25, Amst. 1724.]

and honour the first and chiefest of all Churches; and he saith nothing out of which any other thing may be concluded.

The next is Irenæus¹, who being to show against heretics, that the tradition of the Church is against them, and for him, and thinking it very tedious to run through the successions of all Churches, saith, he will content himself with that which is the greatest, ancientest, best known to all, and founded by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome; for that the whole Church, that is, the company of all faithful ones, that are everywhere, in which the tradition hath been ever preserved, must of necessity agree in her tradition with this, *propter potentiolem principalitatem*, that is: "For that it is the principal of all other." This testimony of Irenæus no way proveth the thing is question. For here is nothing of the dependence of all other Churches on the Church of Rome, in their faith and profession, nor that all Churches have kept the faith in that Church, that is, in cleaving to it, as to their head and mother, as Bellarmine untruly fancieth: but all that is here said, is nothing else, but that undoubtedly the same faith was given and delivered to all other Churches that was delivered by blessed Peter and Paul to the Church of Rome, the chiefest of all.

The two next Greek fathers that are produced to testify for the supremacy are Epiphanius², and Athanasius³, who

¹ "Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quæ habet ab apostolis traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo vel per sui placentiam malam vel vanam gloriam vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam præterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiolem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, ab his qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio."—Iren. advers. Hæres. Lib. III. cap. 3. [p. 201, Oxon. 1702.]

² "Οὐρσάκιος καὶ Οὐάλης, μετὰ λιβέλλων προσελθόντες τῷ μακαρίτῃ Ἰουλίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης ὑπεραπολογούμενοι τοῦ αὐτῶν σφάλματος, κ.τ.λ."—Epiphani. Hæres. LXVIII. [Tom. I. p. 725.]

³ "Οὐκέτι γὰρ κρίσεως δεῖται τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς· κέκριται γὰρ οὐχ ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δεύτερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις. Πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ χώρα συναγομένη ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων ἐγγὺς ἑκατόν. Δεύτερον δὲ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ, γράψαντος

long tarrying in respect of the distance of the place from whence he came, as also for that his bishops could not sooner be gathered together. He was much offended that they who were come before him had passed their sentence before his coming; and thereupon without delay, before he had put off his cloak, or shaken off the dust from his feet, as the story saith¹, assembling the bishops subject to him in a synod, deposed Cyril and Memnon bishop of Ephesus, who were chief agents in the proceedings against Nestorius: which deposition of Cyril and Memnon was something hastily confirmed by the emperor Theodosius. This synod assembled under Cyril in like sort gave sentence against John, and signified to Cœlestinus bishop of Rome what they had done, showing how unadvisedly a few had presumed to condemn a great many, and the bishop of the third see bishops of greater sees, to wit, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cœlestinus of Rome, who was present in the council by his vicegerent: yet referring the final proceeding to his consideration also, he and his bishops being

¹ “Simul atque Ephesum ingressus est (Joannes Antiochenus), antequam pulverem ex itinere contractum excussisset, pallio nondum deposito, coactis in unum quasi collegio quopiam triginta plus minus solo nomine episcopis, qui una cum Nestorio desciverant, blasphemaque verba in proprium caput evomerant. . . rem ausus est impiam qualem nemo ante illum ausus est unquam. Etenim privatim scriptum quoddam confecit, depositionisque nomine sanctissimo Deoque dilectissimo Cyrillo Alexandrinorum episcopo, et pientissimo fratri et comministro nostro Memnoni Ephesiorum episcopo indignam contumeliam imponere studuit; idque omnibus nobis insciis, immo ne ipsis quidem qui injuriam hanc perpassi sunt quid ageretur, aut quamnam ob causam hoc ausi essent intelligentibus.”—Epist. Sacræ Synodi Ephesinæ ad Cœlestinum Romanæ urbis Archiepiscopum. Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. Tom. iv. cap. 17. [Bin. Tom. i. p. 804.]

[“ Ἄμα τε γὰρ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν, πρὶν ἀποπλύνασθαι τὴν ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας κόνιν, πρὶν ἀποδύσασθαι τὸ ἱμάτιον, συναγαγὼν τινὰς τῶν τῷ Νεστορίῳ συναποστατησάντων, καὶ βλασφήμα λαλούντων κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν κεφαλῆς, καὶ μονονουχὶ καταπαιζόντων τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ συλλέξας ὥσπερ κολλήγιον ἑαυτῷ τριάκοντά που τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ἀνθρώπων ἐπισκόπων ἔχόντων ὄνομα, . . . πρᾶγμα τετόλμηκεν ἀνόσιον, ὃ μηδεὶς πώποτε τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ. Συνάπτει γὰρ καταμόνας χαρτίον, καὶ δὴ καθαιρέσεως ὄνομα καὶ ὕβριν προσετρίψατο τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπισκόπῳ Κυρίλλῳ, καὶ τῷ θεοσεβεστάτῳ ἡμῶν ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Μέμνονι τῷ τῆς Ἐφεσίων, οὐδενὸς ἡμῶν εἰδότος, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τῶν ὕβρισθέντων ἐγνωκότων τὸ δρώμενον, ἢ διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν τοῦτο τετολμήκασιν.”

—Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1192.]

as much interested in this business as they that were assembled. In the end, by mediation of many great and worthy ones, John and his bishops, that formerly were misconceited of Cyril, were satisfied, and he sent the confession of his faith unto him; which he approved, and so they were reconciled, and made friends, without any farther intermeddling of the bishop of Rome. Here is nothing to be found that any way argueth or importeth an universality of power in the bishop of Rome, but only his concurrence with the other patriarchs, as prime patriarch, in the weighty and important businesses of the Church: and therefore the fathers of that council¹, writing to the vicars of the bishop of Rome and other bishops, sent by them to the emperor, to inform him concerning the differences that had arisen in the council, and their proceedings, charge and require them to do nothing but according to their direction; assuring them, that if they do otherwise, they will neither ratify that they do, nor admit them to their communion: thereby showing, that though the Roman bishop be to concur with the fathers assembled in councils, yet he is not absolutely there to command, but to follow the directions of the major part. So that he hath a joint interest with others, but not an absolute sovereignty over all others; God therefore having ordained the high tops of patriarchal dignities (as it is in the eighth general council²) that they might jointly concur to uphold the state of the Church, and the truth of religion; and that if one fell, the rest might restore, settle, and re-establish things again. Which course Cyril³, in

¹ “Εἰδέναι δὲ βουλόμεθα τὴν ὑμετέραν ὁσιότητα ὅτι περ εἴ τι τούτων παροφθείη παρ’ ὑμῶν, οὔτε ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος καταδέξεται τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν πραττόμενα, οὔτε ὑμᾶς ἔξει κοινωνούς.”—Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, col. 1313.]

² Apud Binium, Conciliorum, Tom. III. Part. 2. Act. I. p. 881. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 490.]

³ “Ὡς [Νεστορίῳ] καὶ συνεβούλευσα διὰ γραμμάτων ἀποσχέσθαι τῶν οὕτω σκαιῶν καὶ ἐξεστραμμένων ζητημάτων, καὶ τῇ τῶν πατέρων ἀκολουθήσει πίστει, ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ μὲν ὥθη ταῦτα γράφοντα δυσμενῇ . . . Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνάγκη με γραψάσης τῆς αὐτοῦ εὐσεβείας ἐκείσε ταῦτα τὰ γεγονότα εἰπεῖν ἅπαντα, πέμψαι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἴσα τῶν παρ’ ἐμοῦ γραφέντων πρὸς αὐτὸν γραμμάτων, ἐκδεδήμηκεν ἀναγκαίως κληρικὸς τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ὁ ἀγαπητὸς διάκονος Ποσειδώνιος. Ἀναγνωθείσων τοίνυν ἐν συνεδρίῳ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ἡ ἁγία Ῥωμαίων σύνοδος φανερὰ τετύπωκε, κ. τ. λ.

“Γεγράφασι δ’ οὐδὲν ἥσσον καὶ πρὸς τὸν τῆς Αἰλιέων θεοσεβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Ἰουβενάλιον.”—Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, col. 929.]

long tarrying in respect of the distance of the place from whence he came, as also for that his bishops could not sooner be gathered together. He was much offended that they who were come before him had passed their sentence before his coming; and thereupon without delay, before he had put off his cloak, or shaken off the dust from his feet, as the story saith¹, assembling the bishops subject to him in a synod, deposed Cyril and Memnon bishop of Ephesus, who were chief agents in the proceedings against Nestorius: which deposition of Cyril and Memnon was something hastily confirmed by the emperor Theodosius. This synod assembled under Cyril in like sort gave sentence against John, and signified to Cœlestinus bishop of Rome what they had done, showing how unadvisedly a few had presumed to condemn a great many, and the bishop of the third see bishops of greater sees, to wit, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cœlestinus of Rome, who was present in the council by his vicegerent: yet referring the final proceeding to his consideration also, he and his bishops being

¹ “Simul atque Ephesum ingressus est (Joannes Antiochenus), antequam pulverem ex itinere contractum excussisset, pallio nondum deposito, coactis in unum quasi collegio quopiam triginta plus minus solo nomine episcopis, qui una cum Nestorio desciverant, blasphemaque verba in proprium caput evomerant. . . rem ausus est impiam qualem nemo ante illum ausus est unquam. Etenim privatim scriptum quoddam confecit, depositionisque nomine sanctissimo Deoque dilectissimo Cyrillo Alexandrinorum episcopo, et pientissimo fratri et comministri nostro Memnoni Ephesiorum episcopo indignam contumeliam imponere studuit; idque omnibus nobis insciis, immo ne ipsis quidem qui injuriam hanc perpessi sunt quid ageretur, aut quamnam ob causam hoc ausi essent intelligentibus.”—Epist. Sacræ Synodi Ephesinæ ad Cœlestinum Romanæ urbis Archiepiscopum. Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. Tom. iv. cap. 17. [Bin. Tom. i. p. 804.]

[“ Ἄμα τε γὰρ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν, πρὶν ἀποπλύνασθαι τὴν ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας κόνιν, πρὶν ἀποδύσασθαι τὸ ἱμάτιον, συναγαγὼν τινὰς τῶν τῷ Νεστορίῳ συναποστατησάντων, καὶ βλασφήμα λαλούντων κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν κεφαλῆς, καὶ μονονουχὶ καταπαιζόντων τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ συλλέξας ὥσπερ κολλήγιον ἑαυτῷ τριάκοντά που τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ἀνθρώπων ἐπισκόπων ἔχόντων ὄνομα, . . . πρᾶγμα τετόλμηκεν ἀνόσιον, ὃ μηδεὶς πώποτε τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ. Συνάπτει γὰρ καταμόνας χαρτίον, καὶ δὴ καθαιρέσεως ὄνομα καὶ ὕβριν προσετρίψατο τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπισκόπῳ Κυρίλλῳ, καὶ τῷ θεοσεβεστάτῳ ἡμῶν ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Μέμνονι τῷ τῆς Ἐφεσίων, οὐδενὸς ἡμῶν εἰδότος, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τῶν ὑβρισθέντων ἐγνωκότων τὸ δρώμενον, ἧ διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν τοῦτο τετολμήκασιν.”

—Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1192.]

as much interested in this business as they that were assembled. In the end, by mediation of many great and worthy ones, John and his bishops, that formerly were misconceited of Cyril, were satisfied, and he sent the confession of his faith unto him; which he approved, and so they were reconciled, and made friends, without any farther intermeddling of the bishop of Rome. Here is nothing to be found that any way argueth or importeth an universality of power in the bishop of Rome, but only his concurrence with the other patriarchs, as prime patriarch, in the weighty and important businesses of the Church: and therefore the fathers of that council¹, writing to the vicars of the bishop of Rome and other bishops, sent by them to the emperor, to inform him concerning the differences that had arisen in the council, and their proceedings, charge and require them to do nothing but according to their direction; assuring them, that if they do otherwise, they will neither ratify that they do, nor admit them to their communion: thereby showing, that though the Roman bishop be to concur with the fathers assembled in councils, yet he is not absolutely there to command, but to follow the directions of the major part. So that he hath a joint interest with others, but not an absolute sovereignty over all others; God therefore having ordained the high tops of patriarchal dignities (as it is in the eighth general council²) that they might jointly concur to uphold the state of the Church, and the truth of religion; and that if one fell, the rest might restore, settle, and re-establish things again. Which course Cyril³, in

¹ “Εἰδέναι δὲ βουλόμεθα τὴν ὑμετέραν ὁσιότητα ὅτι περ εἴ τι τούτων παροφθείη παρ’ ὑμῶν, οὔτε ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος καταδέξεται τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν πρατόμενα, οὔτε ὑμᾶς ἔξει κοινωνούς.”—Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, col. 1313.]

² Apud Binium, Conciliorum, Tom. III. Part. 2. Act. 1. p. 881. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 490.]

³ “Ὡς [Νεστορίῳ] καὶ συνεβούλευσα διὰ γραμμάτων ἀποσχέσθαι τῶν οὕτω σκαιῶν καὶ ἐξεστραμμένων ζητημάτων, καὶ τῇ τῶν πατέρων ἀκολουθήσει πίστει, ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ μὲν ὥθη ταῦτα γράφοντα δυσμενῇ . . . Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνάγκη με γραψάσης τῆς αὐτοῦ εὐσεβείας ἐκέισε ταῦτα τὰ γεγόνота εἰπεῖν ἅπαντα, πέμψαι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἴσα τῶν παρ’ ἐμοῦ γραφέντων πρὸς αὐτὸν γραμμάτων, ἐκδεδήμηκεν ἀναγκαίως κληρικὸς τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ὁ ἀγαπητὸς διάκονος Ποσειδώνιος. Ἀναγνωθείσων τοίνυν ἐν συνεδρίῳ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ἡ ἁγία Ῥωμαίων σύνοδος φανερὰ τετύπωκε, κ. τ. λ.

“Γεγράφασι δ’ οὐδὲν ἦσσαν καὶ πρὸς τὸν τῆς Αἰλίων θεοσεβέστατον ἐπισκοπον Ἰουβενάλιον.”—Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, col. 929.]

his epistle to John of Antioch, sheweth to have been holden by him: for when he observed that Nestorius his fellow-patriarch erred from the faith, he first admonished him, and threatened to reject him from the communion of his churches. Secondly, he acquainted the bishop of Rome and the western bishops with the impieties and blasphemies of Nestorius; who thereupon rejected him, professing that they would admit none to their communion but such as would condemn him. Thirdly, he wrote to Juvenal bishop of Jerusalem, and to John bishop of Antioch, showing his own dislike of Nestorius; and farther professing, that for his part he was fearful to be cast out of the communion of the western bishops, as he saw he must be, if he accursed not Nestorius.

The next allegation is out of the council of Chalcedon¹, where Theodorus and Ischiron, deacons, in their bills of complaint exhibited to the bishop of Rome as president, and to the whole council, call Leo the bishop, "Most holy and most blessed universal archbishop and patriarch of great Rome." But they that press the testimony of these two distressed deacons, flying to Leo for help, should remember, that in the council of Constantinople² under Mennas, not deacons, but bishops, and they many, are reported to have written to the bishop of Constantinople in this sort: "To our most holy lord, and most blessed father of fathers, John, the archbishop, and universal patriarch;" and Mennas³ himself also is called "Œcumenical Patriarch," and "Archbishop," oftentimes in

¹ "Concilium Chalcedonense, Act. 1, 2, et 3, passim vocat Leonem 'universalis ecclesiæ pontificem.' Et in Epist. ad Leonem: 'Et post hæc,' inquiunt, 'omnia insuper et contra ipsum cui vineæ custodia a salvatore commissa est extendit insaniam, id est contra tuam quoque apostolicam sanctitatem.' Hic vides maximum concilium confiteri, Romano pontifici a Deo ipso vineæ, id est ecclesiæ universæ custodiam esse commissam."—Bellarm. [p. 315.]

"Τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ οἰκουμενικῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ πατριάρχῃ τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης Λέοντι, κ.τ.λ."—Epist. Theodor. Diac. inter Act. Synod. Chalced. Act. III. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1268.]

² "Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου τῷ θεοφιλεστάτῳ καὶ ὁσιωτάτῳ συλλειτουργῷ Ἰωάννῃ."—Epist. Joann. Hierosol. [Act. V. Labbe, Tom. V. col. 1160.]

"Τῷ δεσπότῃ ἡμῶν τῷ πάντα ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ πατρὶ πατέρων, ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ Ἰωάννῃ."—Epist. Episc. secundæ Syriæ. [Labbe, col. 1184.]

³ "Ὁ ἁγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος οἰκουμενικὸς ἀρχιεπίσκοπος καὶ πατριάρχης Μεννᾶς, κ.τ.λ."—[Ibid. Act. IV. col. 1053.]

that council of Constantinople: and yet, I think, they will not acknowledge the bishops of Constantinople to have had an universal supreme commanding power over the whole world.

Hereunto therefore they add another proof out of the relation of the council of Chalcedon¹ made to Leo; wherein the fathers complain of Dioscorus, that as a wild boar he had violently entered into the vineyard of the Lord, and wasted the same, plucking up the true fruitful vines, and planting unfruitful in their places; and that he stayed not there, but reached out his hand against him to whom the keeping of the vineyard was committed by our Saviour, that is, against the bishop of Rome, whom he thought to excommunicate. These words we willingly confess to be words of just complaint, upon great cause made by the fathers of the council, against Dioscorus: but they prove not the thing in question. For we make no doubt but the keeping of the vineyard of the Lord of hosts was committed to the bishop of Rome, not only as well as to other, but in the first place, as being in order and honour the chief: but that he only received from Christ this power, authority, and charge, and others from him, not we only, but many learned amongst themselves, do deny, as Bellarmine testifieth².

There are two other testimonies that may be alleged out of the council of Chalcedon. For Paschasinus, one of the vicegerents of the bishop of Rome in that council, calleth Rome³ the head of the churches, and Leo⁴ the bishop of

¹ “Καὶ ἦν ἂν ὁ ἀντικείμενος ὡς θῆρ ἔξω τῆς μάνδρας καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ὠρυόμενος, . . . καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἅπασιν ἔτι κατ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου τὴν φυλακὴν παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐπιτετραμμένην τὴν μανίαν ἐξέτεινε, λέγομεν δὴ τῆς σῆς ὁσιότητος.”—Relat. Concil. Chalced. ad Leon. Act. xvi. [Labbe, col. 1776.]

² “Quæstio est an episcopi canonice electi accipiunt a Deo suam jurisdictionem, sicut eam accipit summus pontifex, an vero a pontifice.”—Bellarm. de Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 22. [Tom. i. p. 429.]

³ “Πασχασίνος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος φύλαξ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου, ὡς ἔσται ἐν μέσῳ μετὰ καὶ τῶν συνελθόντων αὐτῷ, ἔφη· Τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἀποστολικοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως, κεφαλῆς ὑπάρχοντος πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, προστάξεις ἔχομεν, κ.τ.λ.”—Concil. Chalced. Act. i. [Labbe, col. 864.]

⁴ “Sanctissimus et beatissimus papa, caput universalis ecclesiæ, Leo, &c.”—In Exempl. Epist. Paschasini. In Concil. Chalced. Bin. Tom. ii. p. 141. [Vid. Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1303.]

Rome, head of the universal church. But they who press so much the saying of the pope's legate in favour of the pope, must know, that by head he meant chief in order and honour, and not one having all power originally in himself, and absolutely commanding over all, as the papists now teach. For if he had meant so, he had not been endured by the fathers of that council, who peremptorily pronounce¹, that it was the greatness of the city, and not any power given by Christ or derived to him from Peter, that made the bishop of Rome to be great; and that therefore they would equal the bishop of Constantinople unto him, seeing Constantinople was now become equal unto Rome.

The next testimony that they allege is out of the patriarchal council of Constantinople² under Mennas, wherein the fathers profess by Mennas their president, that they follow and obey the apostolic see, that they communicate with them with whom that see communicateth, and condemn all those it condemneth. Surely, this reason, howsoever it may seem to have some force, yet indeed hath none at all. For there is no question, but that the bishop of Rome, with his western synods, all which, according to the phrase of antiquity, are comprehended under the name of the apostolic see, was more to be esteemed than the particular synod under Mennas: and that therefore they might profess to follow it, and obey the decrees of it; and yet neither think the pope to be universal bishop, nor that the bishop of Rome, with his western bishops, is more to be listened unto and obeyed than all the other bishops of the Christian world. That Adrian³, the bishop of Rome, in his epistle to Tharasius, inserted into the seventh

¹ “Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασιν τὰ πρεσβεῖα· καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ῥν'. θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ.”—Concil. Chalced. Act. xv. [Labbe, col. 1692.]

² “Ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ ἐξακολουθοῦμέν τε καὶ πειθόμεθα, καὶ τοὺς κοινωνικοὺς αὐτοῦ κοινωνικοὺς ἔχομεν, καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατακριθέντας καὶ ἡμεῖς κατακρίνομεν.”—Concil. Constant. sub Menna. Act. iv. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 1057.]

³ “Οὗ [Πέτρου] ὁ θρόνος εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην πρωτεύων διαλάμπει· καὶ κεφαλὴ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχει.”—Hadrian. Epist. ad Tharas. in Concil. vii. [Nicæn. ii.] Act. ii. [Labbe, Tom. viii. col. 772.]

general council, saith, that the see of Rome hath the primacy throughout the whole world, and is the head of all Churches (which is the last allegation of Bellarmine out of councils), is no more than we granted before, if it be rightly understood of a primacy of order and honour, and not of an universal, supreme, commanding power over all.

This is all that Bellarmine can allege out of any ancient council: in which his allegations it will not be amiss for the reader to observe his guileful cunning; who undertaking to produce the testimonies of ancient councils for confirmation of the papacy, bringeth nothing for the most part but the words of particular men, and they either suitors to the pope, agents for him, or popes. To that which he hath out of later councils, as that of Lateran under Innocentius, and that of Lyons, and Florence, I will answer when I come to show the opinions of later times touching the pope's universality of jurisdiction and power; and therefore will pass them over in this place.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

OF THE PRETENDED PROOFS OF THE POPE'S JURISDICTION
TAKEN OUT OF THE DECRETAL EPISTLES OF POPES.

THE next proofs that are brought for confirmation of the universality of papal jurisdiction, are the sayings of popes in their decretal epistles. These epistles Bellarmine¹ sorteth into three ranks, placing in the first the epistles of those

¹ "Tertium argumentum sumitur a summorum pontificum sentiis. Est autem observandum epistolas pontificum in tres quasi classes distribui posse.

"Prima classis continet epistolas pontificum qui sederunt usque ad annum 300. Secunda classis complectitur epistolas eorum pontificum qui sederunt ab anno 600, usque ad nostra tempora.

"Tertia classis comprehendit illas epistolas in quibus et aperte asseritur primatus, et quas constat esse scriptas a sanctis et veris pontificibus, qui floruerunt ab anno 300 ad 600.

"Ad hæc testimonia nihil respondent, nisi esse recentia et supposititia. At quamvis aliquos errores in eas irrepsisse non negaverim, nec indubitatas esse affirmare audeam; certe tamen antiquissimas esse nihil dubito."—Bellarm. De Pontif. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 14. [Tom. I. p. 316.]

popes that lived within the first three hundred years: in the second, the epistles of those that lived after the first six hundred years: and in the third, the epistles of such as came in the midst between these.

Touching the first, he confesseth, that certain errors have crept into them, and that he dareth not pronounce them to be indubitate; but cardinal Cusanus, a man of great learning, reading, and judgment, minceth not the matter as Bellarmine doth, but plainly and in direct words professeth that he thinketh these epistles that go under the names of ancient popes are counterfeit. His words are these¹: “In my opinion the things that are written of Constantine and his donation are apocryphal, as also perhaps some other long and large writings attributed to the holy men Clemens and Anacletus the pope, on which they that desire to magnify the Roman see, which is worthy of all honour, and to exalt it more than is expedient for the Church, or is any way fit, do either altogether or in some sort ground themselves. For, assuredly, if any man would diligently read over and peruse all the writings attributed to those holy men, and compare the times wherein they lived with those writings, and then would be conversant in the works of all the holy fathers, which were till the time of Augustine, Hierome, and Ambrose; and in the books of councils, wherein authenticall writings are

¹ “Sunt meo iudicio illa de Constantino apocrypha, sicut fortassis etiam quædam alia longa et magna scripta sanctis Clementi et Anacleto papæ attributa. In quibus volentes Romanam sedem omni laude dignam plusquam ecclesiæ sanctæ expedit et decet exaltare, se penitus aut quasi fundant. Si quis illas omnes scripturas illis sanctis attributas diligenter perlegeret, et eorum tempora ad illa scripta applicaret, ac deinde in opusculis omnium sanctorum patrum qui usque ad Augustinum, Hieronymum, et Ambrosium fuere, ac etiam de gestis conciliorum, ubi authentica scripta allegantur usum et memoriam haberet; hoc inveniret verum, quia nec in illis omnibus scripturis de illis præfatis epistolis mentio habetur, et etiam ipsæ epistolæ applicatæ ad tempus eorum sanctorum seipsas produnt. Scribitur in Clementis epistolis, quomodo papa fuerit et Petri successor, et post Petri mortem ad sanctum Jacobum has fingit scriptor misisse epistolas qui fuit frater Domini et Hierosolymorum episcopus, et est manifestum Jacobum prius Petro octo annis finisse martyrio vitam. Et hæc una de causis, cur inter catholicas epistolas ea quæ Jacobi sunt præcedunt, ut scribit Beda super Canonicis epistolis in principio.”—Cusan. Concord. Cathol. Lib. III. cap. 2. [p. 782. Bas. 1565.]

alleged, committing them to memory, and making use of them, he would find this to be true, that neither any mention is made of those forenamed epistles in any of those writings, nor that the epistles compared with the times wherein their supposed authors lived, can be made to agree with the times of their life; but by the very circumstance of time bewray themselves to be counterfeit. It is written in the epistles of Clemens, how he was made pope and succeeded Peter; and after the death of Peter, the author of these epistles writeth unto James, who was brother of our Lord and bishop of Jerusalem; and yet it is most manifest that the same James died eight years before Peter, which was one of the causes (as Beda writeth in his commentaries upon the canonical epistles) why the Epistle of James is set first among the catholic epistles." Neither is this the censure of Cusanus only, but Contius¹, a learned canonist, in his annotations upon Gratian, feareth not to pronounce all the decretal epistles, that go under the names of such bishops as lived before Sylvester, to be false and counterfeit.

Besides these censures of learned men, there want not strong and effectual reasons to disprove these epistles. For first, they will easily appear to be counterfeit, because they are barbarously and rudely written, and are not like the writings of those men that lived in the times wherein the supposed authors of those epistles did live, but like the writings of such as lived in later and worse times, after barbarism had prevailed and overflowed all. Secondly, because the style is so different from those indubitate remainders of the epistles of the same popes, found in Cyprian², Eusebius³, and Athanasius⁴, that they cannot be but counterfeit: for whosoever shall compare them, shall find them to differ as much as gold and dross. Thirdly, for that all these supposed epistles are so like one another in style, and oftentimes have the very same sentences, that it is very likely they came all from one and the same forge. Fourthly, because neither Eusebius, Hierome, nor any other ancient writer, maketh any mention of them. Fifthly,

¹ Contius, Annot. in Dist. xxvi. cap. 70.

² Cyprian. Epist. xlvi. et xlviii. In edit. Pamel. [Al. xlix. et l. pp. 92, 94. Oxon. 1682.]

³ Euseb. H. E. Lib. vi. cap. 42.

⁴ Athanas. Apolog. ii. [Tom. i. p. 141.]

because they follow not the old translation in their allegations of scripture, but that of Hierome, which was not in being in those times wherein the supposed authors of these epistles did live. Lastly, which is the reason before used by Cusanus¹, because the epistle to James, written after the death of Peter, as appeareth in the front of it, and so consequently after the twelfth year of Nero, could not be written to James the brother of our Lord, who, as Hierome² testifieth, was slain at Jerusalem in the seventh year of Nero. But whatsoever become of the censure of learned men branding these epistles with the note of forgery, and the reasons brought to disprove them, which cannot easily be answered: yet Bellarmine will prove that these epistles are mentioned by the ancient, and consequently that the Century writers³ say untruly, that hardly any shall be found before the time of Charles the Great that speaketh any thing of them⁴. To this purpose he produceth Isidore, in his preface before his collection of the councils, affirming that he gathered canons out of the epistles of Clemens, Anacletus, Evaristus, and the rest of the Roman bishops, by the advice of eighty bishops; but this is to justify one counterfeit by another; for this preface is thought to be counterfeit, because in it there is mention made of the sixth general council under Agatho, whereas Isidore was dead forty years before the holding of that council. Wherefore he allegeth the council of Vase, as mentioning the same decretals. But the decrees of that council are uncertain, as Binius⁵

¹ Loco citato [P. 280, supra.] Vide etiam Binium in Annot. in Epist. Clement. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 98.]

² "Triginta annos Hierosolymorum rexit ecclesiam, id est, usque ad septimum Neronis annum."—Hieron. In Catal. Script. Eccles. [Al. De Vir. Illustr.] In Jacobo. [Tom. ii. col. 819.]

³ "Nec facile reperias has epistolas ab ullo patrum aut fide digno auctore ab hoc seculo usque ad Caroli Magni ætatem citari."—Cent. Magdeb. Cent. ii. cap. 7. ad fin. [Tom. ii. col. 116. Bas. 1624.]

⁴ "Mentiuntur Magdeburgenses, cum dicunt nullum fide dignum auctorem citasse has epistolas ante tempora Caroli Magni. Nam Isidorus qui 200 annis antiquior est Carolo in proem. sui collect. sac. Can., dicit se ex consilio 80 episcoporum collegisse canones ex epistolis Clementis Anacleti, Evaristi, et cæterorum Romanorum pontificum. Item concilium Vasense can. 6. citat epistolas Clementis, ut nunc exstant."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

⁵ "Sicut acta et decreta hujus concilii propter miram canonum

noteth, by reason of the great confusion that is found in them: and truly, I think, there is no man that can make any sense of that which is cited out of Clement's epistles by that council. Therefore in the third place he addeth Ruffinus, who in his preface before his translation of the Recognitions of Clemens out of Greek, speaketh of an epistle of Clement unto James the brother of our Lord, and saith he turned it out of Greek into Latin: and this, saith Bellarmine, which we have, is undoubtedly the same that he translated, as may be proved out of Gennadius¹: therefore the epistle that is now carried about under the name of Clemens is ancient, and not late or counterfeit. But that these Philistines may fall by their own sword, we will oppose against Bellarmine the cardinal, Baronius the cardinal, against the Roman reader of controversies, the Roman annalist. For Baronius² proveth out of Gennadius³, whom Bellarmine allegeth, that these epistles we have are not the same that Ruffinus translated, because those he translated had prefaces before them, but this of Clement hath none. Thus we see the epistles of the popes of the first three hundred years prove nothing, because they are counterfeit.

Of them that were written by such as lived after the first six hundred years, I shall have a fit opportunity to speak in another place. Wherefore let us come to those of the middle rank, where Bellarmine produceth twelve ancient bishops of Rome, claiming that supreme, absolute, and

confusionem incerta sunt, ita quam ob causam celebratum sit certo affirmari nequit.—Bin. Annot. ad Concil. Vasens. ii. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 721.]

¹ “Denique Ruffinus qui annis 400 præcessit Carolum, præfat. in recognit. Clement. a se conversas ex Græco, meminit Epistolæ Clementis ad Jacobum, et eam se vertisse dicit ex Græco. Esse autem vere hanc versionem Ruffini testatur Gennadius, Lib. de Vir. Illustr. in Ruffino.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² “Gennadius de Ruffino agens in cunctis se e Græco editis versionibus præfationem imponere testatur; adeo ut quæ sine prologo reperiuntur esse translata, non Ruffini sed alterius esse opus affirmet.”—Baron. Anno Dom. 102. num. 6. [Tom. ii. p. 13. Antv. 1617.]

³ “Horum omnium quæcunque præmissis prologis a Latinis leguntur a Ruffino interpretata sunt, quæ autem sine prologo ab alio translata sunt qui prologum facere noluit.”—Gennad. de Viris Illustr. cap. 17. [Inter Opp. Hieron. Tom. ii. col. 960.] Citat. etiam in Annot. Binii ad Epist. i. Clement. ad Jacobum. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 98.]

commanding authority over the whole Church, which we deny.

The first of the twelve is Julius the First¹, in his epistle extant in the second Apology of Athanasius. The witness is good, and we will not except against him; but he deposeth directly against them that produce him; neither is there any better evidence to be desired than this his epistle. For the

¹ “Τί γὰρ καὶ γέγονεν ἄξιον λύπης, ἢ ἐν τίνι ἦν ἄξιον λυπηθῆναι ὑμᾶς οἷς καὶ ἐγράψαμεν; ἢ ὅτι προσετρεψάμεθα εἰς σύνοδον ἀπαντῆσαι; ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἔδει μετὰ χαρᾶς δέξασθαι. Οἱ γὰρ παρρησίαν ἔχοντες ἐφ’ οἷς πεποιήκασι, καὶ ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσι κεκρίκασιν, οὐκ ἀγανακτοῦσιν, εἰ παρ’ ἐτέρων ἐξετάζοιτο ἡ κρίσις, ἀλλὰ θαρρόουσιν, ὅτι ἂν δικαίως ἐκρίνον ταῦτα ἄδिका οὐκ ἂν ποτε γένοιτο. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νίκαιαν μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ συνέλθοντες ἐπίσκοποι οὐκ ἄνευ θεοῦ βουλήσεως συνεχώρησαν ἐν ἐτέρᾳ συνόδῳ τὰ τῆς προτέρας ἐξετάζεσθαι.

“Οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν τῶν περὶ Εὐσεβίου ἀποσταλέντες μετὰ γραμμάτων, λέγω δὴ Μακάριος ὁ πρεσβύτερος καὶ Μαρτύριος καὶ Ἡσύχιος οἱ διάκονοι ἀπαντήσαντες ἐνταῦθα, ὡς οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλθόντας Ἀθανασίου πρεσβυτέρους ἀντιστῆναι, ἀλλ’ ἐν πᾶσι διετρέποντο καὶ διηλέγοντο, τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἠξίωσαν ἡμᾶς ὥστε σύνοδον συγκροτῆσαι, καὶ γράψαι καὶ Ἀθανασίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ εἰς Ἀλεξανδρείαν, γράψαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς περὶ Εὐσέβιον ἵνα ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ πάντων ἡ δικαία κρίσις ἐξενεχθῇ δυνήθῃ.

“Εἰ τοίνυν μηδὲ τῶν περὶ Μαρτύριον καὶ Ἡσύχιον ἀξιωσάντων γίνεσθαι σύνοδον προτρεψάμενος ἡμῖν ἔγω σκύλαι τοὺς γράψαντας, ἕνεκεν τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν αἰτιωμένων ἀδικίαν πεπονθέναι καὶ οὕτως εὐλογος ἦν καὶ δικαία ἡ προτροπή, ἔστι γὰρ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ καὶ θεῷ ἀρέσκουσα.

“Τίνες οὖν εἰσὶν οἱ σύνοδον ἀτιμάζοντες; οὐχὶ οἱ τῶν τριακοσίων τὰς ψήφους παρ’ οὐδέν θέμενοι, καὶ ἀσέβειαν εὐσεβείας προκρίναντες;

“Ἀθανάσιος δὲ ἐμαρτυρήθη μηδὲ ἐν Τύρῳ καταγνωσθεὶς, ἐν δὲ τῷ Μαρεώτῃ μὴ παρεῖναι ἔνθα τὰ ὑπομνήματα κατ’ αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι λέγεται.

“Ἀθανάσιος δὲ καὶ Μάρκελλος οἱ ἐπίσκοποι πλείονας ἔχουσι τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν λέγοντας καὶ γράφοντας... Ὅμως τούτων ὄντων ἡμεῖς, ὑπὲρ ἀκριβείας, οὔτε ὑμῖν οὔτε τοῖς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γράψασι πρόκριμα ποιοῦντες προετρεψάμεθα τοὺς γράψαντας ἐλθεῖν, ἵν’ ἐπειδὴ πλείους εἰσὶν οἱ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γράψαντες ἐπὶ συνόδου πάντα ἐξετασθῇ.

“Ὅμως δὲ γνώρισαι ὑμῖν ἀναγκαῖον ὅτι εἰ καὶ μόνος ἔγραψα, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐμοῦ μόνου ἐστὶν αὕτη ἡ γνώμη, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν, καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις τοῖς μέρεσιν ἐπισκόπων.

“Ἐπίσκοποι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ πάσχοντες, καὶ οὐχ αἱ τυχοῦσαι ἐκκλησίαι αἱ πάσχουσαι, ἀλλ’ ὧν αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι δι’ ἑαυτῶν καθηγήσαντο. Διατὶ δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας μάλιστα οὐκ ἐγράφετο ἡμῖν; ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὀρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια... Οὐχ οὕτως αἱ Παύλου διατάξεις, οὐχ’ οὕτως οἱ πατέρες παραδεδώκασιν, ἄλλος τύπος ἐστὶν οὗτος, καὶ καινὸν τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα.”—Julii Epist. In Apolog. Athanas. [Tom. i. pp. 142, 153.]

bishops of the East having written to Julius, and blamed him for communicating with such as they rejected, and going about to reverse the acts which they had agreed on; and having told him, that the greatness of cities maketh not the power of bishops to be the greater; and that therefore he should not take on him to be greater than other bishops, and to undo that which they had done, because he was bishop of a greater city than any of them was: he answereth modestly in this his epistle, that he hopeth he offendeth not in desiring them to come to a synod, that therein their proceedings might be examined; seeing the Nicene council appointeth the acts of one council to be re-examined in another. Secondly, he showeth, that they whom they sent to inform him and the western bishops touching their proceedings against Athanasius, being convicted by the presbyters of Athanasius, desired him to call a council of his own bishops, and to write to Athanasius, and those of Eusebius' part, to come unto the same; wherein they doubted not but they should prove the things they had alleged. Thirdly, he showeth that if without the solicitation of their agents he had desired them to meet in council, it had been no fault, nor any way prejudicial unto them. Fourthly, that they who will not have their proceedings re-examined condemn councils, by admitting such as were condemned by the Nicene council; that Athanasius was not condemned at Tyrus; that he was not present when he was condemned at Mareotta; and that many wrote in his defence to him and the other bishops of the West; and that yet he forejudged nothing, but would have had matters defined in a council. Fifthly, he showeth that though he wrote alone, yet he reporteth not his own opinion only, but of all the bishops of Italy, and the countries thereabout. Lastly, he telleth them, that the bishops they proceeded against being no vulgar persons, but bishops of such Churches as the apostles themselves planted, before they had proceeded against them, they should first have written to him and his colleagues, that from thence might have been defined what was right and good; than which course what could be more fitting? For Athanasius bishop of the second see, with other his adherents, were not to be judged by bishops of an inferior rank, especially in a matter concerning the faith, without first consulting the bishop of the first see and his colleagues, that from thence an action of such consequence might

out to divers pastures to feed in, and rivers of water to drink, may have their diversity of pastors under the same chief Shepherd Christ Jesus: neither is there any unity implied in the whole Church, or in the Churches of divers provinces, which may not be preserved, as well by the multitude and diversity of pastors, bound and knit together in the bond of conspiring consent and agreement, as by the unity of one chief pastor." And in this sort we shall find the Church of God to have stood in perfect unity in the first and best ages thereof, without finding any want of the help of one chief pastor: for how could there be a more perfect unity in the whole Church, than when the pastor of each particular Church, chosen by the clergy and people of the same, was appointed by the metropolitan and all the rest of the bishops of the province, for his sincerity in profession, and godliness of conversation, and ordained to the work of the ministry by the joint imposition of all their hands? when the metropolitans of several provinces were confirmed by the primate or patriarch, but ordained by the bishops of their provinces¹? when the patriarchs² elected by the clergy and people, and ordained by their metropolitans, sent their synodal letters one to another, testifying and expressing their faith and profession, before they were received and allowed one of another, and before they were accounted and reputed for lawful patriarchs³?

Wherefore presupposing that the government of the Church is not monarchical in respect of any one supreme pastor on earth, but mixed; and having seen how, notwithstanding the diversity of many pastors, the Church may be

¹ "Placuit ut quisquis metropolitanus infra tres menses consecrationis suæ ad fidem suam exponendam, palliumque suscipiendum ad apostolicam sedem non miserit, commissa sibi careat dignitate; sitque licentia metropolitanis aliis, post secundam et tertiam commonitionem viduatis ecclesiis cum consilio Romani pontificis ordinando episcopos subvenire."—Decret. Damasi, ex Decret. Ivonis Carnotensis, Lib. I. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1034.]

² Vide Greg. Lib. I. Epist. xxiv. [Al. xxv. Tom. II. col. 507, sq.]

³ "Ἀρχαία τις, τἀληθὲς δὲ φράσαι, ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις διῆκε, τοὺς πρὸς ἱεραρχίαν ἀγομένους τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν τὰς ἱεραρχίας ἐγχειρίζουσιν ὥς αν ἔχοι τὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτῶν ἀνατίθεςθαι."—Exemplar litterarum Tharasii ad summos sacerdotes et episcopos Antiochiæ, Alexandriæ, et Sanctæ Urbis. in 3 Act. Synod. VII. [Labbe, Tom. VIII. col. 810.]

preserved in peace and unity, let us more exactly and distinctly consider what the ancient form of church policy and government was.

If we look into the monuments of antiquity, we shall find that there were anciently three subordinations in the Church. For the actions of the bishop of each particular Church of a city, and places adjoining, were subject to the censure and judgment of the rest of the bishops of the same province; amongst whom for order sake there was one chief, to whom it pertained to call them together, to sit as moderator in the midst of them being assembled, and to execute what by joint consent they resolved on: the actions of the bishops of a province, and a provincial synod consisting of those bishops, were subject to a synod consisting of the metropolitans and other bishops of divers provinces. This synod was of two sorts. For either it consisted of the metropolitans and bishops of one kingdom and nation only, as did the councils of Africa; or of the metropolitans and bishops of many kingdoms. If of the metropolitans and bishops of one kingdom and state only, the chief primate was moderator; if of many, one of the patriarchs, and chief bishops of the whole world, every Church being subordinate to some one of the patriarchal Churches, and incorporate into the unity of it. Thirdly, the actions of the bishops of a whole kingdom and patriarchship were subject to an œcumenical synod, consisting of all the patriarchs, and the metropolitans and the bishops subject to them.

Touching provincial councils, to the censures whereof the actions of particular Churches are subject, they were by the ancient canons of the Church to be holden in every province twice every year. "It is very necessary¹," say the fathers of the council of Nice, "that there should be a synod twice every year in every province; that all the bishops of the province meeting together, may in common think upon those things that are doubtful and questionable; for the despatch of ecclesiastical businesses, and the determining of matters in controversy." "We think it were fit²," say the fathers in

¹ "Καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξεν ἐκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν δις τοῦ ἔτους συνόδους γίνεσθαι· ἵνα κοινῇ πάντων τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομένων τὰ τοιαῦτα ζητήματα ἐξετάζοιτο."—Concil. Nicæn. Can. v. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 36.]

² "Διὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς χρείας, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων δια-

out to divers pastures to feed in, and rivers of water to drink, may have their diversity of pastors under the same chief Shepherd Christ Jesus: neither is there any unity implied in the whole Church, or in the Churches of divers provinces, which may not be preserved, as well by the multitude and diversity of pastors, bound and knit together in the bond of conspiring consent and agreement, as by the unity of one chief pastor." And in this sort we shall find the Church of God to have stood in perfect unity in the first and best ages thereof, without finding any want of the help of one chief pastor: for how could there be a more perfect unity in the whole Church, than when the pastor of each particular Church, chosen by the clergy and people of the same, was appointed by the metropolitan and all the rest of the bishops of the province, for his sincerity in profession, and godliness of conversation, and ordained to the work of the ministry by the joint imposition of all their hands? when the metropolitans of several provinces were confirmed by the primate or patriarch, but ordained by the bishops of their provinces¹? when the patriarchs² elected by the clergy and people, and ordained by their metropolitans, sent their synodal letters one to another, testifying and expressing their faith and profession, before they were received and allowed one of another, and before they were accounted and reputed for lawful patriarchs³?

Wherefore presupposing that the government of the Church is not monarchical in respect of any one supreme pastor on earth, but mixed; and having seen how, notwithstanding the diversity of many pastors, the Church may be

¹ "Placuit ut quisquis metropolitanus infra tres menses consecrationis suæ ad fidem suam exponendam, palliumque suscipiendum ad apostolicam sedem non miserit, commissa sibi careat dignitate; sitque licentia metropolitanis aliis, post secundam et tertiam commonitionem viduatis ecclesiis cum consilio Romani pontificis ordinando episcopos subvenire."—Decret. Damasi, ex Decret. Ivonis Carnotensis, Lib. I. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1034.]

² Vide Greg. Lib. I. Epist. xxiv. [Al. xxv. Tom. II. col. 507, sq.]

³ "Ἀρχαία τις, τἀληθὲς δὲ φράσαι, ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις διῆκε, τοὺς πρὸς ἱεραρχίαν ἀγομένους τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν τὰς ἱεραρχίας ἐγχειρίζουσιν ὡς αὐτοὶ τὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτῶν ἀνατίθεσθαι."—Exemplar litterarum Tharasii ad summos sacerdotes et episcopos Antiochiæ, Alexandriæ, et Sanctæ Urbis. in 3 Act. Synod. VII. [Labbe, Tom. VIII. col. 810.]

preserved in peace and unity, let us more exactly and distinctly consider what the ancient form of church policy and government was.

If we look into the monuments of antiquity, we shall find that there were anciently three subordinations in the Church. For the actions of the bishop of each particular Church of a city, and places adjoining, were subject to the censure and judgment of the rest of the bishops of the same province; amongst whom for order sake there was one chief, to whom it pertained to call them together, to sit as moderator in the midst of them being assembled, and to execute what by joint consent they resolved on: the actions of the bishops of a province, and a provincial synod consisting of those bishops, were subject to a synod consisting of the metropolitans and other bishops of divers provinces. This synod was of two sorts. For either it consisted of the metropolitans and bishops of one kingdom and nation only, as did the councils of Africa; or of the metropolitans and bishops of many kingdoms. If of the metropolitans and bishops of one kingdom and state only, the chief primate was moderator; if of many, one of the patriarchs, and chief bishops of the whole world, every Church being subordinate to some one of the patriarchal Churches, and incorporate into the unity of it. Thirdly, the actions of the bishops of a whole kingdom and patriarchship were subject to an œcumenical synod, consisting of all the patriarchs, and the metropolitans and the bishops subject to them.

Touching provincial councils, to the censures whereof the actions of particular Churches are subject, they were by the ancient canons of the Church to be holden in every province twice every year. "It is very necessary¹," say the fathers of the council of Nice, "that there should be a synod twice every year in every province; that all the bishops of the province meeting together, may in common think upon those things that are doubtful and questionable; for the despatch of ecclesiastical businesses, and the determining of matters in controversy." "We think it were fit²," say the fathers in

¹ "Καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξεν ἐκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν δις τοῦ ἔτους συνόδους γίνεσθαι· ἵνα κοινῇ πάντων τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομένων τὰ τοιαῦτα ζητήματα ἐξετάζοιτο."—Concil. Nicæn. Can. v. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 36.]

² "Διὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς χρείας, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων δια-

the council of Antioch, "that in every province synods of bishops should be assembled twice every year." The first council of Constantinople¹ decreeth the same: and the fathers assembled in the council of Chalcedon² complain that in some provinces the synods of bishops are not holden, and that thereby many ecclesiastical matters needing reformation are neglected: and therefore they appoint, "that the bishops of every province shall assemble every year twice at that place which the bishop of the mother-city shall think fit, to amend all things that shall be found to be amiss in the province." Here we see the necessity of holding these synods, and by whom they were to be called and moderated. Wherefore let us now proceed to see of whom they consisted, what causes they examined and determined, what the power of the metropolitan originally was, and what in process of time, by positive constitution, upon due and just considerations, it grew to be.

Touching the persons that provincial synods consisted of, it is clear and evident, that not only bishops, but presbyters also, were present in these assemblies, and had decisive voices: whereupon the council of Antisiodorum saith: "Let all the presbyters being called come to the synod in the city³." The council of Tarracon: "Let letters be sent by the metropolitan to his brethren, that they bring with them to the synod, not only some of the presbyters of the cathedral church, but also of each diocese⁴." And the fourth council of Toledo, describ-

λύσεις, καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξε συνόδους καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων γίνεσθαι δεύτερον τοῦ ἔτους."—Concil. Antioch. Can. xx. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 593.]

¹ "Εὐδηλον ὡς τὰ καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἢ τῆς ἐπαρχίας σύνοδος διοικήσει, κατὰ τὰ ἐν Νικαίᾳ ὠρισμένα."—Concil. Constantinop. Can. II. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1126.]

² "Ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς ἡμετέρας ἀκοὰς, ὡς ἐν ταῖς ἐπαρχίαις αἱ κεκανονισμέναι σύνοδοι τῶν ἐπισκόπων οὐ γίνονται, καὶ ἐκ τούτου πολλὰ παραμελεῖται τῶν διορθώσεως δεομένων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων. Ὁρίσε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος κατὰ τοὺς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων κανόνας δις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συντρέχειν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, ἔνθα ἂν ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος δοκιμάσῃ, καὶ διορθοῦν ἕκαστα τὰ ἀνακύπτοντα."—Concil. Chalced. Can. XIX. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1689.]

³ "Ut medio Maio omnes presbyteri ad synodum in civitatem veniant, et Kalendis Novembris omnes abbates ad concilium conveniant."—Concil. Antisiod. Can. VII. [Labbe, Tom. VI. col. 643.]

⁴ "Epistolæ tales per fratres a metropolitano sunt dirigendæ, ut non solum a cathedralibus ecclesiis presbyteri, verum etiam de diœ-

ing the form of celebrating provincial synods, hath these words: "Let the bishops assembled go to the church, and sit according to the time of their ordination; and after all the bishops are entered and set, let the presbyters be called, and the bishops sitting in compass, let presbyters sit behind them, and the deacons stand before them¹." In the first council of Toledo we find these words: *Consedentibus presbyteris, astantibus diaconis, et cæteris qui intererant concilio congregato, Patronus episcopus dixit, &c.*²; that is, "The presbyters sitting together with the bishops, the deacons standing before them, and the rest, which were present in the council assembled, Patronus the bishop said," &c. The like we read of a synod holden by Gregory the pope. The words are these: *Gregorius papa coram sacratissimo corpore beati Petri apostoli, cum episcopis omnibus Romanæ Ecclesiæ, et presbyteris residens, assistantibus diaconis, et cuncto clero, dixit, &c.*³; that is, "Gregory the pope sitting before the most sacred body of blessed Peter, with all the bishops of the Roman Church and the presbyters also, the deacons standing before them, and all the clergy, said," &c. And that presbyters were not only present in provincial synods, but had decisive voices as well as bishops, it appeareth by their subscribing to the decrees of such synods⁴, in the very same form and manner that bishops did. So that it will be found most false and untrue that Bellarmine⁵ hath, that presbyters have

cesanis ad concilium trahant, et aliquos de filiis ecclesiæ secularibus secum adducere debeant."—Concil. Tarracon. Can. XIII. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 700.]

¹ "Post ingressum omnium episcoporum atque concessum, vocentur deinde presbyteri quos causa probaverit introire. Nullus se inter hos ingerat diaconorum. Post hos ingrediantur diaconi probabiles, quos ordo poposcerit interesse: et corona facta de sedibus episcoporum, presbyteri a tergo eorum resideant. Diacones in conspectu episcoporum stent."—Concil. Tolet. iv. Can. 4. [Labbe, Tom. vi. col. 1451.]

² Concil. Tolet. i. Initio. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 1470.]

³ Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. cap. 88. [Al. Append. Ep. v. Tom. ii. col. 1288.]

⁴ Vide Subscript. Concil. Eliberitan. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 991] et Synod. sub Gregorio [ut supra.]

⁵ "Omnia concilia, tum generalia, tum provincialia, etiam antiquissima, a solis episcopis celebrata sunt."—Bellarm. De Clericis, Lib. i. cap. 14. [Tom. ii. p. 133.]

no voices in synods: and the ancient form of our convocation here in England, wherein not only the archbishops and bishops, but sundry presbyters also, as well out of cathedral-churches as dioceses at large, are present and have decisive voices, will clearly refute the same.

The causes that were wont to be examined and determined in the meeting of the bishops of the province, were the ordinations of bishops¹, when any churches were void, and the depriving and rejecting of all such as were found unworthy of their honour and place; and in a word, any complaint of wrong done in any church was there to be heard. "Let the provincial synods be holden twice every year," saith the council of Antioch², "and let the presbyters and deacons be present; and as many as think they have been any way hurt or wronged, there expect the determination of the synod." The power of the metropolitan was in calling the rest of the bishops to the synod, in appointing the place of their meeting, and in sitting as president in the midst of them: and so were things moderated, that neither the rest might proceed to do anything without consulting him, nor he to do anything without them, but was tied in all matters of difference to follow the major part³; and if he neglected his duty in convocating his brethren, that so things might be determined by common consent, he was by the canons subject to censure and punishment. Thus at first all matters were to be determined, heard, and ended by synods, and they holden twice every year; but in process of time, when the governors of the Church could not conveniently assemble in synod twice a year, the fathers of the sixth general council⁴ decreed, that yet in any case there should be a

¹ "Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι δίχα συνόδου, καὶ παρουσίας τοῦ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει τῆς ἐπαρχίας."—Concil. Antioch. Can. xix. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 593.]

² "Διὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς χρείας, καὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων διαλύσεις καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξε συνόδους καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων γίνεσθαι δεύτερον τοῦ ἔτους, . . . ὥστε ἐν αὐταῖς ταύταις ταῖς συνόδοις προσιέναι πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἡδικῆσθαι νομιζόντας, καὶ παρὰ τῆς συνόδου ἐπικρίσεως τυγχάνειν. Μὴ ἐξεῖναι δέ τινας καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ποιεῖσθαι ἄνευ τῶν πεπιστευμένων τὰς μητροπόλεις."—Can. xx. [Ibid.]

³ "Περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτὸν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης."—Can. ix. [col. 589.]

⁴ "Ἐδοξεν ὥστε τρόπῳ παντὶ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τὴν τῶν προγεγραμμένων ἐπισκόπων διὰ τὰ ὡς εἰκὸς ἀναφυόμενα ἐκκλησιαστικὰ κεφάλαια ἐν ἐκάστη

synod of bishops once every year for ecclesiastical questions. Likewise the seventh general council decreeth in this sort: "Whereas the canon willeth judicial inquisition to be made twice every year by the assembly of bishops in every province, and yet, for the misery and poverty of such as should travel to synods, the fathers of the sixth council decreed, it should be once in the year, and then things amiss to be redressed, we renew this later canon¹." So that, whereas at the first there was a synod of bishops in every province twice in the year, now it was sufficient if the bishops met once. But afterwards, many things falling out to hinder their happy meetings, we shall find that they met not so often, and therefore the council of Basil² appointeth episcopal synods to be holden once every year, and provincial at the least once in three years. And so in time causes growing many, and the difficulties intolerable in coming together, and in staying to hear these causes thus multiplied and increased, it was thought fitter to refer the hearing of complaints and appeals to metropolitans, and such like ecclesiastical judges, limited and directed by canons and imperial laws, than to trouble the pastors of whole provinces, and to wrong the people by the absence of their pastors and guides.

Thus having spoken of the authority of the metropolitan and his council in every province, it remaineth that we come to synods of a larger extent. These, besides œcumenical, whereof we will not yet speak, were of two sorts: patriarchal,

ἐπαρχία γίνεσθαι σύνοδον."—Concil. Sext. [Al. Quinisext. in Trullo.] Can. viii. [Labbe, Tom. vii. col. 1349.]

¹ "Ἐπειδὴ περ κανὼν ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων· δις τοῦ ἔτους καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν χρὴ γίνεσθαι διὰ συναθροίσεως ἐπισκόπων τὰς κανονίκας ζητήσεις, διὰ γοῦν τὴν συντριβὴν καὶ τὸ ἐνδεῶς ἔχειν πρὸς ὁδοιπορίαν τοῦς συναθροιζομένους, ὥρισαν οἱ τῆς ἑκτῆς συνόδου ὅσιοι πατέρες ἐξ ἅπαντος τρόπου καὶ προφάσεως ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ γίνεσθαι, καὶ τὰ ἐσφαλμένα διορθοῦσθαι· τοῦτον οὖν τὸν κανόνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνανεοῦμεν."—Concil. Nicæn. ii. Can. vi. [Labbe, Tom. viii. col. 1252.]

² "Sancta synodus statuit atque præcipit synodum episcopalem in qualibet diœcesi post octavas dominicæ resurrectionis vel alia die secundum consuetudinem diœcesum, ad minus semel in anno, ubi non est consuetudo bis, annatim celebrari. Celebretur quoque in singulis provinciis saltem infra biennium a fine concilii generalis et deinde ad minus semel de triennio in triennium provinciale concilium in loco tuto."—Concil. Basil. [Sess. xv. Labbe, Tom. xvii. col. 288.]

wherein one of the patriarchs and chief bishops of the world sat as president ; or national, consisting of the bishops of many provinces within one country or kingdom, wherein the primate sat as president : of which sort the councils of Africa were : concerning which councils it is ordered in the third council of Carthage¹, that once every year there shall be a general assembly of the bishops of Africa, to which all the provinces which have *primas sedes*, that is, first sees, and so may hold provincial councils, shall out of their councils send two bishops, or as many as they shall think fit ; but that out of Tripolis, because of the poverty of the bishops of it, one bishop shall come. In these councils the legates of the bishop of Rome were sometimes present, not as presidents but assistants, as other metropolitans were. There were many provinces which had *primas sedes*, that is, first sees, and so consequently many primates ; yet for distinction, some call him that was bishop of that first see (which was in honour before all the rest of the same country and kingdom, and to whom in all common deliberations the other metropolitans did resort) by an excellency the primate, and the rest by the common name of metropolitans ; in which sense the bishop of Carthage was primate of all Africa : and so is a primate in order and honour before metropolitans, but inferior unto a patriarch. Of this distinction of degrees of honour amongst metropolitans and chief bishops, Hugo de Sancto Victore writeth in this sort : *Post sacerdotes altiores sunt principes sacerdotum, id est, episcopi : supra quos iterum sunt archiepiscopi : et supra illos qui dicuntur primates : supra quos quidam patriarchas constituere volunt ; alii eosdem patriarchas et primates dicunt*² : that is, “After priests we are to reckon the chief priests, that is, bishops, as in the first degree and honour above them : above whom again are archbishops, and above them they that are

¹ “Placuit ut propter causas ecclesiasticas quæ ad perniciem plebium sæpe veterascunt singulis quibusque annis concilium convocetur. Ad quod omnes provinciæ quæ primas sedes habent de conciliis suis ternos legatos mittant, ut et minus invidiosi minusque hospitibus sumptuosi conventus plena possit esse auctoritas. De Tripoli autem propter inopiam episcoporum unus episcopus veniat.”—Concil. Carthag. III. Can. 2. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1399.]

² Hugo de Sancto Victore, De Sacram. Fid. Lib. II. Part. 3. cap. 5. [Tom. III. p. 445, Mogunt. 1617.]

named primates :” above whom some will have patriarchs to be placed, but others will have patriarchs and primates to be all one. Rabanus¹, in his book *De Institutione Clericorum*, sorteth bishops into three ranks : patriarchs, archbishops, who also are named metropolitans, and ordinary bishops.

CHAPTER XXXI.

OF PATRIARCHS, WHO THEY WERE, AND THE REASON WHY THEY WERE PREFERRED BEFORE OTHER BISHOPS.

TOUCHING the patriarchs, they were in the beginning but only three; to wit, the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The reason, as some think, why the bishops of these places were preferred before other and made patriarchs, was in respect had to blessed Peter, who was in sort before expressed in order and honour the first and chiefest of the apostles. For Antioch was honoured for that he sat there for a certain space, and afterwards governed it by Evodius : Alexandria, for that he placed Mark his scholar there : and Rome, because it was the place of his death and martyrdom ; where in his body he stayeth and expecteth the resurrection of the dead, and the second coming of Christ. All the Churches founded by any apostle are rightly called apostolic, but these more specially in which the apostle Peter sat. *Secunda sedes*, saith Anacletus, *apud Alexandriam beati Petri nomine a Marco ejus discipulo consecrata est. Tertia autem sedes apud Antiochiam ejusdem beati Petri apostoli habetur honorabilis*² : that is, “ The second see, and in degree and honour next unto that of Rome, was consecrated at Alexandria, by the authority of blessed Peter, by Mark his scholar ; and the third see honourable for Peter’s presence in the same is at Antioch.” *Nihil*, saith Leo writing to Anatolius, *Alexandriæ sedi, ejus quam per Sanctum Marcum evangelistam beati Petri discipulum meruit, pereat dignitatis.*

¹ “Ordo episcoporum tripartitus est, id est, in patriarchis, archiepiscopis qui et metropolitani sunt, et episcopis.”—Raban. De Instit. Cler. Lib. I. cap. 5. [Tom. vi. p. 4. Colon. Agripp. 1624.]

² Anaclet. Pap. Epist. iii. [Labbe, Tom. I. col. 530.]

*Antiochena quoque ecclesia in qua primum prædicante apostolo Petro, Christianum nomen exortum est, in paternæ constitutionis ordine perseveret; et in gradu tertio collocata, nunquam se fiat inferior*¹: that is, "Let the see of Alexandria lose no part of that dignity which it obtained by St Mark the evangelist, the disciple of blessed Peter. Let the Church of Antioch also, in which upon Peter's preaching the name of Christians first began, continue in that degree and order wherein the constitution of the fathers set it, and being placed in the third degree, let it never be put lower." This did Leo write, when the bishop of Constantinople sought to have the second place in the Church of God, and to be preferred before the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. Gregory writeth to the same effect to Eulogius, bishop of Alexandria. His words are: *Cum multi sint apostoli, pro ipso tamen principatu sola apostolorum principis sedes in autoritate convaluit, quæ tribus in locis unius est. Ipse enim sublimavit sedem, in qua etiam quiescere et præsentem vitam finire dignatus est. Ipse decoravit sedem in qua evangelistam discipulum misit. Ipse firmavit sedem, in qua septem annis quamvis discessurus sedit. Cum ergo unius atque una sit sedes, cui ex autoritate divina tres nunc episcopi præcident, quicquid ego de vobis boni audio, mihi imputo*²: that is, "Whereas there were many apostles, yet in respect of the chieftly that Peter had, as being prince of the apostles, his see only grew to be in chief authority, which in three places is yet the see but of one and the same apostle. For he exalted that see in which he pleased to rest, and end this present life; he beautified that see in which he placed Mark his scholar; and he firmly and strongly settled that see in which he sat seven years, though with purpose in the end to leave it. Whereas therefore there is one see of one apostle, in which by divine authority three sit as presidents, whatsoever good I hear of you, I impute it to myself." And again in the same place to Eulogius, having spoken to him of the dignity of Peter's chair, in which he sat, he saith: "He hath spoken to me of Peter's chair, who himself sitteth on Peter's chair." This is the opinion of these Roman bishops touching the reason of the

¹ Leo I. Pap. ad Anatol. Epist. liii. [Al. cvi. Tom. i. col. 1167.]

² Greg. Lib. vi. Epist. xxxvii. [Al. Lib. vii. Epist. xl. Tom. ii. col. 888.]

exaltation of the sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, above other episcopal sees; who, how partially soever they may be thought to be affected to the chair of Peter, yet herein do they mainly cross the conceit of the Romanists at this day, in that they teach that other bishops succeed Peter in the chair, and that chieftly and primacy he had, as well as the bishop of Rome.

The dignity of these apostolical Churches was confirmed in the Nicene council, and each of them confined within the ancient bounds and limits thereof. "Let the ancient customs," say the Nicene fathers, "continue in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria may have power over all these; seeing the bishop of Rome hath the like custom. In like sort in Antioch, and other provinces, let every Church retain and keep her own degree and honour¹." Bellarmine² much troubleth himself about this limitation and bounding of these patriarchs, as prejudicial to the illimited jurisdiction of the Roman bishop; and therefore though it be most clear that there was a particular assignation of Churches to every of these patriarchs, yet he seeketh to avoid the evidence of these words. For whereas Ruffinus saith, it was

¹ "Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατεῖτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνήθές ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις."—Concil. Nicæn. Can. vi. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 36.]

² "Primo, exponit Ruffinus, Lib. x. Hist. Eccles. cap. 6, decretum esse a concilio, ut Alexandrinus episcopus habeat curam Ægypti, sicut habet episcopus Romanus curam suburbanarum ecclesiarum.

"At falsa expositio est; nam si episcopus Romanus est primus et præcipuus patriarcha, quomodo credibile est illi assignatam angustissimam regionem, aliis autem patriarchis minoribus latissimam.

"Secunda expositio est Theodori Balsamonis in explic. hor. can. et Nili in suo libro contr. Prim., consilium decrevisse, ut episcopus Alexandrinus habeat curam totius Ægypti sicut Romanus episcopus habet curam totius Occidentis. Hæc quidem sententia liberalior est, sed tamen falsa.

"Sunt autem circa hunc canonem aliqua notanda. Primo ex Nicolao I. in Epist. ad Michael. concilium Nicænum nihil statuisse circa Romanam ecclesiam; quoniam potestas ejus non ab hominibus, sed a Deo est; sed tantum ex forma Romanæ ecclesiæ constituisset statum aliarum ecclesiarum."—Bellarm. De Pontif. Rom. Lib. ii. cap. 13. [Tom. i. p. 314.]

decreed by the council of Nice, that the bishop of Alexandria should have care and charge over Egypt, as the bishop of Rome hath of the Churches near that city; and Theodorus Balsamon, in the explication of the Nicene canons, with Nilus, in his book against the primacy, interpreteth the words of the Nicene decree in this sense, that the bishop of Alexandria should have the charge of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, and the confirming of the metropolitans in those parts, because the bishop of Rome, who hath a care of the West, confirmeth the metropolitans of the West; he maketh this construction of the words of the council: "Let the bishop of Alexandria have the charge of Egypt, seeing the bishop of Rome was wont to permit him so to have, before any council had decreed it. And so," he saith, "Nicholas the pope, in his Epistle to Michael the emperor, understandeth the words;" which yet is most untrue: for Nicholas saith no such thing, but only that the council maketh the custom of the Roman Church the pattern for others to follow. But the eighth general council¹, which no doubt understood the words of the Nicene fathers far better than Bellarmine, sheweth plainly that the meaning of the Nicene canon was, that the bishop of Alexandria should have power over Egypt and the provinces pertaining to it, to confirm the metropolitans in the same, seeing the like custom prevaieth in the Roman Church: and this council confirmeth the same distinction of the bounds of jurisdiction, within which every patriarch is to contain himself, both for old Rome and new, and for the other Churches of Alexandria and Antioch. The canons of the Nicene council, translated out of the Arabian tongue, and published by Turrian, Pisanus, and Binnius, will fully clear this point, if our adversaries give any credit unto them. For in the eighth of those canons², the decree, about the meaning whereof we contend, is thus set down: *Constitutum est, ut episcopus Ægypti, id est, patriarcha Alexandrinus, præsideat et habeat potestatem totius Ægypti*: that is, "It is ordained that the bishop

¹ "Sancta et universalis Nicæna prima synodus antiquam consuetudinem jubet servari per Ægyptum et provincias quæ sub ipsa sunt, ita ut horum omnium Alexandrinus episcopus habeat potestatem."—Concil. Constant. iv. can. 17. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 643.]

² Apud Binium, Tom. primo Conciliorum, p. 352. [Colon. Agripp. 1606. Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 304.]

of Egypt, that is, the patriarch of Alexandria, shall sit as president, and have power over all Egypt, and over all places, cities, and towns, which are round about it: because so it is fit, and because likewise the bishop of Rome, that is the successor of Peter the apostle, hath power over all the cities and places which are about Rome. And in like sort let the bishop of Antioch have power over that whole province," &c. But because perhaps these canons, though published by themselves, as rare secrets of antiquity lately brought to light, will be of little credit with them, I will add one reason more, which to me seemeth very forcible, to confirm our interpretation of the words of the Nicene fathers. There was anciently a great contention between the Church of Rome and the Church of Constantinople about the Churches of Bulgaria¹; either of these Churches making claim thereunto, and seeking to bring them within the compass of their own jurisdiction: which contention could not have been, if the one of these two Churches had had an illimited extent of jurisdiction. But that neither of them had any such illimited jurisdiction, it is evident, in that neither Constantinople nor Rome urge any such thing for justification of their claim, but stand upon their converting of the people of Bulgaria to the Christian faith, and the planting of religion amongst them. Which either of these pretending rather than other, sought thereby to justify a title of jurisdiction and authority over them.

Wherefore resolving that we have the true meaning of the Nicene canon, let us return thither whence we have a little digressed, namely, to the discourse of patriarchical Churches and bishops set in order and honour before all other. These, as I have already showed, were at first but three, to which afterwards two other were added: first Constantinople, and afterwards Hierusalem. Touching the Church and bishop of Constantinople, after that city was by Constantine made the seat of the empire, and thereby as much or more honoured than any city in the world, the bishop thereof, before little esteemed, grew exceeding great; and in the second council, which was the first of Constantinople², was made a patriarch in degree of honour next the

¹ Binius, in Vita Hadriani II., Tom. III. Concil. Part. 2. [p. 820, sqq. Labbe, Tom. x. col. 397, sqq.]

² "Τὸν μὲν τοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς

bishop of Rome, and before the other two; and again in the council of Chalcedon¹ confirmed in the same. And though Leo resisted against this act of the council of Chalcedon, and peremptorily protested that he would not suffer the Church of Alexandria to lose the dignity of the second see, and the Church of Antioch of the third; and his successors many of them persisted in the same resistance; yet they were forced in the end to give way to the exaltation of the Constantinopolitan Church: so that after the time of Justinian the emperor, they never made any more words about this matter. Whereby we see that to be true of Hierome², *Orbis major est urbe*: that is, "The world is greater than any one city of the world, though Rome itself." The Church of Hierusalem, as being the place of Christ's passion, and whence the preaching of the gospel took beginning, was ever much honoured; yet was it not so much as a metropolitan Church at the first: but the bishop and clergy thereof were subject to the bishop of Cæsarea as their metropolitan, and the bishop of Antioch as their patriarch; as Hierome³, writing to Pammachius against John of Hierusalem, testifieth: and thereupon Leo⁴, writing to Maximus bishop of Antioch, blameth Juvenal bishop of Hierusalem for seeking to subject Palestina to himself, and chargeth him with insolent boldness for that attempt. But the fathers⁵

τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην."—Concil. Constantinop. can. 3. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1126.]

¹ "Θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ."—Concil. Chalcedon. Act. xvi. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1733.]

² Hieron. ad Evagrium. [Sive Evangelum. Epist. cxlvi. Tom. I. col. 1076.]

³ "Ni fallor hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palæstinæ metropolis Cæsarea sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia."—Id. ad Pammachium contra Johannem Hierosolymitanum, § 37. Tom. II. col. 447.]

⁴ "In Ephesina synodo, quæ impium Nestorium cum dogmate suo perculit, Juvenalis episcopus ad obtinendum Palæstinæ provinciæ principatum credidit se posse proficere; et insolentes ausus per commentitia scripta firmare."—Leo, Epist. lxii. [Al. Epist. cxix. Tom. I. col. 1215.]

⁵ "Tempore prædicti principis, Justiniani videlicet, congregata est synodus generalis apud Constantinopolim, tempore domini Vigili Papæ, Eutychii Constantinopolitani, Apollinaris Alexandrini, Pauli Antiocheni, et Eustochii Hierosolymitani patriarcharum, super tribus capitulis, &c. In qua synodo post alias populo Dei necessarias institutiones quas

of the fifth general council thought good to honour the Church of Hierusalem, where Christ suffered, and rose again from death: and therefore, whereas the bishop thereof had formerly but a bare title, and a pre-eminence in sitting before other, they made him a patriarch in order the fifth; and that he might have metropolitans subject unto him, they took some parts of the diocese of Alexandria and Antioch from the bishops of those Churches, and put them under him: so that now we have five patriarchs of the Christian Church. Touching these, the eighth general council¹ taketh order that no man shall offer any indignity to any of them. To these they were wont to wish all prosperity and long life in the conclusion of their councils. Without these, no council was holden to be full and perfect. These might convocate the metropolitans of their several divisions, and hold a patriarchal council, which was of greater authority than either those in the several provinces, or of a whole nation, formerly mentioned, because it consisted of more, and more honourable bishops: yet had the patriarchs no greater authority over the metropolitans within their larger circuits, than the metropolitans within their lesser compass. These were by the order of the eighth general council² to confirm the metropolitans subject

pro tempore promulgandas decreverat sanctorum patrum qui ad eam convenerant auctoritas, prædictam Deo amabilem Hierosolymitanam honorare ecclesiam, et ejus episcopo locum inter patriarchas dare, communi sanxit voluntate, reverentiam exhibens sanctæ resurrectioni. Et quoniam prædicta Dei cultrix civitas quasi in limite Alexandrini et Antiocheni patriarcharum erat, nec haberet unde illi urbi ordinaret suffraganeos nisi utrique patriarchæ aliquid detraheret; visum est expedire ab utroque aliquid detrahere, ut eidem juxta formam aliorum patriarchatum ordinaret subjectos. Subtraxerunt ergo Antiocheno Cæsariensem et Scythopolitanum metropolitanos, Alexandrino vero Rubensem et Berythensem item metropolitanos.”—In Fragmento Concil. v. [Constantinop. II.] Apud Binium, Tom. II. Concil. p. 606. [Colon. Agripp. 1606.]

¹ “Definimus neminem prorsus mundi potentium quenquam eorum qui patriarchalibus sedibus præsent in honorare aut movere a proprio throno tentare, sed omni reverentia et honore dignos judicare; præcipue quidem sanctissimum papam senioris Romæ, deinceps autem Constantinopoleos patriarcham, deinde vero Alexandriæ, ac Antiochiæ, atque Hierosolymorum.”—Concil. Œcumen. VIII. [Constantinop. IV.] can. 21. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 646.]

² “Sancta et universalis Nicæna prima synodus antiquam consue-

unto them, either by imposition of hands, or giving the pall; but inferior bishops they might not meddle with, but were to leave them to the ordering of their metropolitans.

CHAPTER XXXII.

HOW THE POPE SUCCEEDETH PETER; WHAT OF RIGHT BELONGETH TO HIM; AND WHAT IT IS THAT HE UNJUSTLY CLAIMETH.

WE deny not but that blessed Peter had a kind of primacy of honour and order, that in respect thereof, as all metropolitans do succeed him, as being greater than other bishops in honour and place, so the patriarchs yet more specially, and amongst them the Roman bishops in the first place. We will not therefore put our adversaries to so much pains as some other have done, to prove that Peter was at Rome, that he died there, and that the bishop of Rome succeedeth him. But this is it which we say, that he succeeded him in the bishoprick of that city, and in the honour of being one of the prime bishops of the world, as the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch likewise did; but not in the condition of being universal bishop, that is, such a one in whom all episcopal power and authority is originally invested; from whom it is derived to others; and who may limit and restrain the use of it in other, as seemeth good unto himself. For Peter was not such an apostle, but had only a joint commission with the rest, who were put into it immediately by

tudinem jubet servari per Ægyptum et provincias quæ sub ipsa sunt, ita ut horum omnium Alexandrinus episcopus habeat potestatem; dicens, Quia in Romanorum civitate hujusmodi mos prævaluit, qua pro causa et hæc magna et sancta synodus tam in seniori et nova Roma, quam in sede Antiocheæ ac Hierosolymorum, priscam consuetudinem decernit in omnibus conservari, ita ut earum præsules universorum metropolitānorum qui ab ipsis promoventur, et sive per manus impositionem, sive per pallii dationem, episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant potestatem; videlicet ad convocandum eos urgente necessitate ad synodalem conventum, vel etiam ad coercendum illos et corrigendum, cum fama eos super quibusdam delictis forsitan accusaverit.—Can. 17. [col. 643.]

Christ as well as he, though he were in some sort the first man in it.

We deny not therefore to the Roman bishop his due place among the prime bishops of the world, if therewith he will rest contented; but universal bishop in sort before expressed we dare by no means admit him to be, knowing right well, that every bishop hath in his place, and keeping his own standing, power and authority immediately from Christ, which is not to be restrained or limited by any but by the company of bishops; wherein though one be chief for order sake, and to preserve unity, and in such sort that all things must take their beginning from him, yet he can do nothing without them.

The bishop of Constantinople, as I have already noted, in the time of the second general council, obtained to be one of the four patriarchs, by reason of the greatness of his Church and city; and in the fourth holden at Chalcedon, to have equal privileges with the bishop of Rome: but not contenting himself long with this equality, soon after he sought to be above him, and would be called universal bishop, seeking thereby to subject to himself all other bishops and Churches: in which proud claim he was resisted by Gregory the First¹, who professeth, that whosoever assumeth this title, overthroweth the dignity and honour of all other bishops, in his pride is like Lucifer, and may rightly be thought to be a forerunner of antichrist. "Paul the apostle," saith Gregory²,

¹ "Cum se nova præsumptione atque superbia frater meus universalem episcopum appellet, ita ut sanctæ memoriæ decessoris mei tempore adscribi se in synodo tali hoc superbo vocabulo faceret; quamvis cuncta acta illius synodi sede contradicente apostolica soluta sint; triste mihi aliquid serenissimus Dominus innuit, quod non eum corripuit qui superbit; sed magis ab intentione mea declinare studuit, qui in hac causa evangeliorum et canonum humilitatis atque rectitudinis veritatem defendo. Qua in re a prædicto fratre et consacerdote meo contra evangelicam sententiam, contra beatum quoque Petrum apostolum et contra omnes ecclesias, contraque statuta canonum agitur." —Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxiv. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xxi. Tom. ii. col. 751.]

² "Certe Paulus apostolus cum audiret quosdam dicere, 'Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego vero Cephæ,' hanc dilacerationem corporis Domini per quam membra ejus aliis quodammodo se capitibus sociabant, vehementissime perhorrescens exclamavit, dicens, 'Numquid Paulus pro vobis crucifixus est, aut in nomine Pauli baptizati estis?' Si ergo ille membra Dominici corporis certis extra Christum quasi

“when he heard certain men say, ‘I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, and I of Cephas,’ trembling, and quaking exceedingly, to hear and see this tearing and rending asunder of the Lord’s body, through which his members joined themselves in companies factiously unto other heads, cried out aloud, saying, ‘Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?’ In such sort therefore did he decline the particular subjecting of the members of the Lord’s body to certain heads, as it were, besides Christ, yea though they were the apostles themselves. And what wilt thou be able to answer to Christ the head of the universal Church in the trial of the last judgment, which goest about by assuming the title of universal bishop, to put under thyself all the members of his mystical body? Who is it, I pray thee, whom thou proposest to thyself for imitation in taking to thee so perverse a title, but he who despising the legions of angels joined with him in society as companions, sought to climb up above them to the height of singularity, that neither he might seem to be under any, nor any might be found over whom he was not: who also said, ‘I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my

capitibus et ipsis quidem apostolis subjici partialiter evitavit; tu quid Christo universalis scilicet ecclesiæ capiti in extremi judicii es dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet conaris universalis appellatione supponere? Quis, rogo, in hoc tam perverso vocabulo nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui despectis angelorum legionibus secum socialiter constitutis ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut et nulli subesse, et solus omnibus præesse videretur? Qui etiam dixit, ‘In cælum conscendam, super astra cœli exaltabo solium meum. Sedebō in monte testamenti, in lateribus aquilonis. Ascendam super altitudinem nubium, similis ero Altissimo.’

“Quid enim fratres tui omnes universalis ecclesiæ episcopi, nisi astra cœli sunt? quorum vita simul et lingua inter peccata erroresque hominum quasi inter noctis tenebras lucent. Quibus dum cupis temetipsum vocabulo elato præponere, eorumque nomen tui comparatione calcare, quid aliud dicis, nisi; ‘In cælum conscendam, super astra cœli exaltabo solium meum’? Annon universi episcopi nubes sunt, qui et verbis prædicationis pluunt, et bonorum operum luce coruscant? Quos dum vestra fraternitas despiciens sub se premere conatur, quid aliud dicit nisi hoc, quod ab antiquo hoste dicitur, ‘Ascendam super altitudinem nubium’?

“Certe Petrus apostolus primus membrum sanctæ et universalis ecclesiæ, Paulus, Andreas, Johannes quid aliud quam singularium sunt plebium capita? et tamen sub uno capite omnes membra.”—Id. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxviii. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xviii. col. 742.]

throne above the stars of heaven, I will sit in the mountain of the testament, in the sides of the North; I will ascend above the height of the clouds, and will be like unto the Most High? For what are thy brethren, all the bishops of the universal Church, but the stars of heaven; whose life, and tongue or speech, do shine in the midst of the sins and errors of men, as it were in the midst of the darkness of the night; whose name and honour while thou seemest to trample under thy feet, in that thou seekest by this title of pride to prefer thyself before them, what else dost thou say, but, 'I will ascend into heaven, and exalt my seat above the stars of heaven?' Are not all the bishops of the Church clouds, who by the words of their preaching pour down the graces of God like showers of rain, and shine through the light of good works; whom whiles your brotherhood despising seeketh to bring under itself, what other thing doth it say but this, which is said of the old enemy, 'I will ascend above the height of the clouds?'" And a little after the same Gregory addeth: "Surely Peter the apostle was the first member of the holy and universal Church; Paul, Andrew, and John, what other thing are they but heads of particular parts of the people and Church of God? and yet notwithstanding they are all members of the Church under one head." Thus doth this holy man and worthy bishop dislike that any amongst the bishops of the Christian Church should be so proud and insolent, as to seek to be over all, and subject to none; to subject unto himself all the members of Christ, as to a head, and to challenge unto himself to be universal bishop: for that if any such be, if he fall into error or heresy he draweth all other with him, and overthroweth the state of the whole Church¹. Yet do the Roman bishops at this day take all these things unto themselves: for they subject all Christ's members to themselves, as to heads of the universal Church, upon peril of everlasting damnation; they will be subject to none, or have any to be over them; so that all depends of them, their standing is the stay of all, and their fall the ruin of all; and if they err, all err.

¹ "Si igitur illud nomen in ea ecclesia sibi quisquam arripit quod apud bonorum omnium iudicium fecit, universa ergo ecclesia, quod absit, corrui, si quando is qui appellatur universalis cadit."—Id. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxii. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xx. col. 749.]

But perhaps it will be said, that the name of universal bishop is not simply evil, nor these claims simply to be disliked; but when they are made by them to whom it pertaineth not to make them, such as the bishops of Constantinople were. Surely this evasion will not serve the turn. For Gregory saith in the same place, that no bishop of Rome ever assumed this title, *ne dum privatum aliquid daretur uni, honore debito sacerdotes privarentur universi*: that is, “Lest while some singular thing were given to one, all bishops should be deprived of their due honour:” thereby showing that this title, and the claims accompanying it, are simply to be disliked, as prejudicial to the state of the whole Church, and the honour and dignity of all other bishops, by whomsoever they be made. Some man perhaps will be desirous to know how our adversaries seek to decline the evidence of this clear testimony of so great a Roman bishop, witnessing against them in a matter of so great consequence. I will therefore set down briefly in this place what I find anywhere said by any of them in answer to this authority. The credit of the author is such, that they dare take no exception against him; and the generality of his speech is such, that what he disliketh in the Constantinopolitan bishop, he confesseth to be evil in any other, and particularly in the bishop of Rome. And therefore the only thing that they can devise whereby to darken the clear light of truth, is this; that the bishop of Constantinople did so and in such sense challenge to be universal bishop, that he only would have been a bishop, and there should have been no more; than which nothing could be more absurdly said. For the thing that the Roman bishops disliked in those of Constantinople, was not the putting of all other from being bishops, but the preferring themselves before other, the subjecting of other to themselves, the encroaching upon the privileges and rights of other, and the challenging of the power of ordination, and confirmation of them, whom it pertained not to them to ordain or confirm; as appeareth by the epistles of Leo¹, blaming Anatolius for sub-

¹ “Post illa itaque ordinationis tuæ non inculcata principia, post consecrationem Antiocheni episcopi quam tibimet contra regulam canonicam vindicasti, doleo etiam in hoc dilectionem tuam esse prolapsum ut sacratissimas Nicænorum canonum constitutiones conareris infringere: tanquam opportune se tibi hoc tempus obtulerit quo

jecting all unto himself, for depriving other metropolitans of their due honour, by encroaching upon their rights, and for taking upon him to ordain the bishop of Antioch, who was one of the patriarchs. That the bishops of Constantinople sought not so to be universal bishops, that there should be no other bishops but they only, is most evident by the epistles of Leo and Gregory¹, in that they ordained bishops themselves, and are blamed by them for presuming to ordain such as they should not have ordained. Wherefore the most that they can be conceived to have desired and sought in assuming the title of universality, is no more but the investing of the fulness of all power and jurisdiction ecclesiastical originally in themselves, and thereby the subjecting of all other to a necessity of deriving ministerial power and authority from them; of seeking ordination at their hands, and being in all things pertaining to episcopal office subject to them: all which things are challenged by the bishop of Rome. For the Romanists at this day teach, that the fulness of all power and jurisdiction ecclesiastical is originally in the pope, and that he communicateth a part thereof unto others, with such limitations as seemeth best unto himself; that all other bishops receive their jurisdiction from him; that all the bishops of the world cannot judge him; that he may dispose of all the kingdoms of the world; that his standing is the stay of all; that his fall would be the ruin of all; and that therefore we must persuade ourselves he cannot err. And hence indeed it followeth, that he only is bishop in truth, and that there are no other. For if the pope may take from any bishop, so often as he seeth cause, as many as he pleaseth of them that are subject to him; if he may reserve unto himself what cases he will, and inhibit bishops to meddle with them; if he may give leave to preach, minister sacraments, and to do all other ecclesiastical duties, to whom he will, within any diocese of the world; if in general councils, where the power of jurisdiction is principally exercised, where the great affairs of the Church are treated of, where doubts are resolved, controversies determined, articles

secundi honoris privilegium sedes Alexandrina perdiderit, et Antiochena ecclesia proprietatem tertiæ dignitatis amiserit: ut his locis juri tuo subditis omnes metropolitani episcopi proprio honore priventur.—Leo, Epist. liii. [Al. Epist. cvi. Tom. i. col. 1161. Ven. 1753.]

¹ Vid. Epist. Gregor. supra citat.

of faith defined, and laws made that bind the whole Church, he have so absolute power, that he is neither bound to follow the greater nor the lesser part of bishops there present, but may determine what he pleaseth, when they have all done and said what they can; if the assurance of finding out the truth, and decreeing that which is good and behoofful, rest not partly in him and partly in them, but only in him, as our adversaries teach;—then are bishops indeed no bishops; no judges of controversies, but counsellors only to advise the pope; no lawgivers to the Church, but such as must receive laws from the pope; no commanders in their own right in the Church in any degree, but mere lieutenants, or, to speak more truly and properly, vassals to the pope.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

OF THE PROOFS BROUGHT BY THE ROMANISTS FOR CONFIRMATION OF THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE POPE'S JURISDICTION AND POWER.

IT is evident by that which hath been said, that that universality, whereof Gregory speaketh in his epistles, and which he so peremptorily condemneth, is claimed by the popes his successors at this day; and consequently, that they are in his judgment the forerunners of antichrist, and in pride like Lucifer. Yet because there is nothing so absurd, that some will not defend; nothing so false, which some will not endeavour to prove true; let us see what the Romanists can say for proof and confirmation of the universal jurisdiction of their popes. Surely as men careful to uphold the state of the papacy, under the shadow of the boughs of which tree they so sweetly rest, and repose themselves, they have turned over their books to see what may be said, and out of them allege against us the testimonies of councils, popes, fathers Greek and Latin, and the practice of popes, whence such a peerless power may be proved and inferred.

The first testimony that they bring out of any council is out of the epistle written by the fathers of the second general

council to Damasus bishop of Rome¹, and the other bishops of the West; wherein the fathers say, (if we believe these men) that they came together to Constantinople by the mandate of the pope, whose letters the emperor sent unto them; and confess that the Roman Church is the head, and they the members. Truly this is a very ill beginning, and may make us justly fear that we shall find little good dealing in that which followeth. For there is no part of this true, which in the front of all their proofs is by them so confidently alleged. For thus the matter standeth between the fathers of that council and the bishop of Rome. The bishops assembled at Constantinople writ to the bishop of Rome, and the rest of the bishops of the West assembled in a council at Rome, signifying, that they had been invited by them out of their brotherly love, as their own members, to come to their council; and that they wished nothing more than that they had the wings of doves, that they might fly away and rest with them: but that the state of their Churches not permitting them to be so long absent, and that intending at the time they understood of their letters to come no farther than Constantinople, they could not come, but had sent notwithstanding certain unto them. This is all that is contained in the letter of those fathers written to the bishop of Rome: in all which there is no word of any mandate of the pope, but of a friendly and loving entreaty of the western bishops, desiring the presence of their brethren of the East; no word of head and members,

¹ "Secundum concilium generale in Epist. ad Damasum, quæ exstat apud Theodoretum, lib. v. Hist. cap. 9, dicit se convenisse apud urbem Constantinopolim ex mandato literarum pontificis per Imperatorem ad se missarum. Et ibidem fatentur Romanam ecclesiam caput esse, se autem membra."—Bellarm. De Rom. Pontif. Lib. II. cap. 13. [Tom. I. p. 315.]

"Ἐπειδὴ μέντοι τὴν ἀδελφικὴν περὶ ἡμᾶς ἀγάπην ἐπιδεικνύμενοι σύνοδον ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης Θεοῦ βουλήσει συγκροτοῦντες καὶ ἡμᾶς ὡς οἰκεία μέλη προσεκαλέσασθε διὰ τῶν τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως γραμμάτων, κ. τ. λ."—Epist. Concil. Constant. ad Damas. apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. cap. 9. [p. 204, Cantabr. 1720.]

"Cum itaque constet primam synodum a Sylvestro indictam a Constantino promotam fuisse, concedendum est hanc quoque secundam universalem synodum auctoritate sedis pontificiæ indictam et auxilio imperatoris congregatam esse."—Binius, in not. ad Concil. Constant. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1153.]

but of fellow-members, nor any thing that may prove a commanding power in the pope. Nay, the contrary is most strongly from hence to be proved. For it was the emperor, and not the pope, that called them to Constantinople; they refused to come to Rome, though they had received the letters of the Roman bishop and his colleagues, intreating and desiring them to come to Rome; they abode at Constantinople, and were esteemed to be the general council, though the pope held a council in the West at the same time; which should have been accounted general, rather than this, if all assurance of finding out the truth and making good laws did rest in the pope only: and lastly, they ordained bishops of the greatest and most famous Churches of the world, such, and in such sort, as the pope did not greatly like, and yet was forced to give way to their doings, and to ratify that which they had done.

The second allegation to prove the universality of the pope's jurisdiction, is, that the fathers of the third general council, holden at Ephesus¹, professed that they deposed Nestorius by force of the mandatory letters of Cœlestinus bishop of Rome, and that in their epistle to Cœlestinus they say, they reserved the judgment of the cause of John, patriarch of Antioch, to him, as being more doubtful. The former of these two things they endeavour to prove out of Evagrius²; the latter out of the epistle written by the fathers of that council, extant in the council itself. For the clearing of this objection we must observe that Nestorius³, patriarch of Con-

¹ "Tertium concilium, ut est apud Evagrium, Lib. i. Hist. cap. 4, dicit se deponere Nestorium ex mandato literarum Cœlestini papæ Romani. Et in epistola ad eundem Cœlestinum idem concilium scribit se causam Joannis patriarchæ Antiocheni quæ magis dubia erat quam causa Nestorii non fuisse ausum judicare, sed reservasse judicio ipsius Cœlestini: quæ omnia perspicue indicant supremam Romani pontificis auctoritatem." — Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "Ἀναγκαίως κατεπειχθέντες ἀπό τε τῶν κανόνων, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ Κελεστίνου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας, δακρύσαντες πολλάκις ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν σκυθρωπὸν ἐχωρήσαμεν ἀπόφασιν. Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς τοίνυν παρ' αὐτοῦ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὥρισε διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἁγίας συνόδου, ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τοῦ τε ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος καὶ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱερατικοῦ." — Epist. Concil. Ephes. apud Evagr. Hist. Eccles. Lib. i. cap. 4. p. 254, Cantabr. 1720.]

³ See these things in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, the seventh Book of Socrates' Hist., and the first of Evagrius.

stantinople, having uttered certain heretical and impious speeches touching the personal union of the natures of God and man in Christ, whereby many were scandalized, the first amongst the patriarchs that took notice of it was Cyril bishop of Alexandria in Egypt; who after he found that Nestorius would not be reclaimed by admonitions, called a synod of his bishops, and condemned the absurd and heretical positions of Nestorius, and required him to anathematize them; otherwise threatening that he and his bishops would reject him from their communion, and hold them as brethren who under his jurisdiction resisted against him. This his proceeding he signified to the bishop of Rome, who approved and commended the same; and with his whole synod of western bishops encouraged him to go forward; wishing him not to doubt of his concurrence with him, but, as having all the authority and power he and his bishops had, to provide for the Church of Constantinople, and to let Nestorius know, that he was cut off from the unity of the body of their Churches, if he should not within a certain number of days anathematize his wicked doctrine, and profess the faith touching the generation of Christ the Son of God, which the Roman Church, the Church of Alexandria, and Christian religion everywhere, preacheth. Hereupon Nestorius, fearing the course that Cyril would take against him, desired the emperor to summon a general council. To this council came Nestorius, and the bishops that were under him; and Cyril with his bishops, assisted with the concurrence of the resolution and direction of the bishop of Rome, and other bishops of the West, though absent; but John, the patriarch of Antioch, and his bishops, were not come. Whereupon after a while, the bishops that were present, being weary of staying there, began to proceed without him, requiring Nestorius to appear in the synod, and to answer to such things as should be objected to him; which when he refused to do, the fathers assembled, finding by manifest proof that he had taught impiously, condemned and deposed him, compelled so to do by the canons, and the letters of the bishop of Rome, and his western bishops, who had set a time within which if he submitted not himself they would reject him from their communion. Five days after the condemnation and deposition of Nestorius, came John the patriarch of Antioch with his bishops, excusing himself for his

long tarrying in respect of the distance of the place from whence he came, as also for that his bishops could not sooner be gathered together. He was much offended that they who were come before him had passed their sentence before his coming; and thereupon without delay, before he had put off his cloak, or shaken off the dust from his feet, as the story saith¹, assembling the bishops subject to him in a synod, deposed Cyril and Memnon bishop of Ephesus, who were chief agents in the proceedings against Nestorius: which deposition of Cyril and Memnon was something hastily confirmed by the emperor Theodosius. This synod assembled under Cyril in like sort gave sentence against John, and signified to Cœlestinus bishop of Rome what they had done, showing how unadvisedly a few had presumed to condemn a great many, and the bishop of the third see bishops of greater sees, to wit, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cœlestinus of Rome, who was present in the council by his vicegerent: yet referring the final proceeding to his consideration also, he and his bishops being

¹ “Simul atque Ephesum ingressus est (Joannes Antiochenus), antequam pulverem ex itinere contractum excussisset, pallio nondum deposito, coactis in unum quasi collegio quopiam triginta plus minus solo nomine episcopis, qui una cum Nestorio desciverant, blasphemaeque verba in proprium caput evomerant. . . rem ausus est impiam qualem nemo ante illum ausus est unquam. Etenim privatim scriptum quoddam confecit, depositionisque nomine sanctissimo Deoque dilectissimo Cyrillo Alexandrinorum episcopo, et pientissimo fratri et comministro nostro Memnoni Ephesiorum episcopo indignam contumeliam imponere studuit; idque omnibus nobis insciis, immo ne ipsis quidem qui injuriam hanc perpassi sunt quid ageretur, aut quamnam ob causam hoc ausi essent intelligentibus.”—Epist. Sacrae Synodi Ephesinae ad Cœlestinum Romanae urbis Archiepiscopum. Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. Tom. iv. cap. 17. [Bin. Tom. i. p. 804.]

[“ Ἄμα τε γὰρ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν, πρὶν ἀποπλύνασθαι τὴν ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας κόνιν, πρὶν ἀποδύσασθαι τὸ ἱμάτιον, συναγαγὼν τινὰς τῶν τῷ Νεστορίῳ συναποστατησάντων, καὶ βλασφήμα λαλούντων κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν κεφαλῆς, καὶ μονονουχὶ καταπαιζόντων τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ συλλέξας ὥσπερ κολλήγιον ἑαυτῷ τριάκοντά που τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ἀνθρώπων ἐπισκόπων ἔχόντων ὄνομα, . . . πρᾶγμα τετόλμηκεν ἀνόσιον, ὃ μηδεὶς πώποτε τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ. Συνάπτει γὰρ καταμόνας χαρτίον, καὶ δὴ καθαιρέσεως ὄνομα καὶ ὕβριν προσετρίψατο τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπισκόπῳ Κυρίλλῳ, καὶ τῷ θεοσεβεστάτῳ ἡμῶν ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Μέμνονι τῷ τῆς Ἐφεσίων, οὐδενὸς ἡμῶν εἰδότης, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τῶν ὕβρισθέντων ἐγνωκότων τὸ δρώμενον, ἢ διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν τοῦτο τετολμήκασιν.”

—Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1192.]

as much interested in this business as they that were assembled. In the end, by mediation of many great and worthy ones, John and his bishops, that formerly were misconceited of Cyril, were satisfied, and he sent the confession of his faith unto him; which he approved, and so they were reconciled, and made friends, without any farther intermeddling of the bishop of Rome. Here is nothing to be found that any way argueth or importeth an universality of power in the bishop of Rome, but only his concurrence with the other patriarchs, as prime patriarch, in the weighty and important businesses of the Church: and therefore the fathers of that council¹, writing to the vicars of the bishop of Rome and other bishops, sent by them to the emperor, to inform him concerning the differences that had arisen in the council, and their proceedings, charge and require them to do nothing but according to their direction; assuring them, that if they do otherwise, they will neither ratify that they do, nor admit them to their communion: thereby showing, that though the Roman bishop be to concur with the fathers assembled in councils, yet he is not absolutely there to command, but to follow the directions of the major part. So that he hath a joint interest with others, but not an absolute sovereignty over all others; God therefore having ordained the high tops of patriarchal dignities (as it is in the eighth general council²) that they might jointly concur to uphold the state of the Church, and the truth of religion; and that if one fell, the rest might restore, settle, and re-establish things again. Which course Cyril³, in

¹ “Εἰδέναι δὲ βουλόμεθα τὴν ὑμετέραν ὁσιότητα ὅτι περ εἴ τι τούτων παροφθείη παρ’ ὑμῶν, οὔτε ἡ ἀγία σύνοδος καταδέξεται τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν πραττόμενα, οὔτε ὑμᾶς ἔξει κοινωνούς.”—Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, col. 1313.]

² Apud Binium, Conciliorum, Tom. III. Part. 2. Act. I. p. 881. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 490.]

³ “Ὡς [Νεστορίῳ] καὶ συνεβούλευσα διὰ γραμμάτων ἀποσχέσθαι τῶν οὕτω σκαιῶν καὶ ἐξεστραμμένων ζητημάτων, καὶ τῇ τῶν πατέρων ἀκολουθεῖν πίστει, ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ μὲν ὥθη ταῦτα γράφοντα δυσμενῇ . . . Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνάγκη με γραψάσης τῆς αὐτοῦ εὐσεβείας ἐκέισε ταῦτα τὰ γεγόνота εἰπεῖν ἅπαντα, πέμψαι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἴσα τῶν παρ’ ἐμοῦ γραφέντων πρὸς αὐτὸν γραμμάτων, ἐκδεδήμεκεν ἀναγκαίως κληρικὸς τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ὁ ἀγαπητὸς διάκονος Ποσειδώνιος. Ἀναγνωθείσων τοίνυν ἐν συνεδρίῳ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ἡ ἀγία Ῥωμαίων σύνοδος φανερὰ τετύπωκε, κ. τ. λ.

“Γεγράφασι δ’ οὐδὲν ἡσσον καὶ πρὸς τὸν τῆς Αἰλίων θεοσεβέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Ἰουβενάλιον.”—Inter Act. Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, col. 929.]

his epistle to John of Antioch, sheweth to have been holden by him: for when he observed that Nestorius his fellow-patriarch erred from the faith, he first admonished him, and threatened to reject him from the communion of his churches. Secondly, he acquainted the bishop of Rome and the western bishops with the impieties and blasphemies of Nestorius; who thereupon rejected him, professing that they would admit none to their communion but such as would condemn him. Thirdly, he wrote to Juvenal bishop of Jerusalem, and to John bishop of Antioch, showing his own dislike of Nestorius; and farther professing, that for his part he was fearful to be cast out of the communion of the western bishops, as he saw he must be, if he accursed not Nestorius.

The next allegation is out of the council of Chalcedon¹, where Theodorus and Ischiron, deacons, in their bills of complaint exhibited to the bishop of Rome as president, and to the whole council, call Leo the bishop, "Most holy and most blessed universal archbishop and patriarch of great Rome." But they that press the testimony of these two distressed deacons, flying to Leo for help, should remember, that in the council of Constantinople² under Mennas, not deacons, but bishops, and they many, are reported to have written to the bishop of Constantinople in this sort: "To our most holy lord, and most blessed father of fathers, John, the archbishop, and universal patriarch;" and Mennas³ himself also is called "Œcumenical Patriarch," and "Archbishop," oftentimes in

¹ "Concilium Chalcedonense, Act. 1, 2, et 3, passim vocat Leonem 'universalis ecclesiæ pontificem.' Et in Epist. ad Leonem: 'Et post hæc,' inquiunt, 'omnia insuper et contra ipsum cui vineæ custodia a salvatore commissa est extendit insaniam, id est contra tuam quoque apostolicam sanctitatem.' Hic vides maximum concilium confiteri, Romano pontifici a Deo ipso vineæ, id est ecclesiæ universæ custodiam esse commissam."—Bellarm. [p. 315.]

"Τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ οἰκουμενικῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ πατριάρχῃ τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης Λέοντι, κ. τ. λ."—Epist. Theodor. Diac. inter Act. Synod. Chalced. Act. III. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1268.]

² "Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου τῷ θεοφιλεστάτῳ καὶ ὁσιωτάτῳ συλλειτουργῷ Ἰωάννῃ."—Epist. Joann. Hierosol. [Act. V. Labbe, Tom. V. col. 1160.]

"Τῷ δεσπότῃ ἡμῶν τῷ πάντα ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ πατρὶ πατέρων, ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ Ἰωάννῃ."—Epist. Episc. secundæ Syriæ. [Labbe, col. 1184.]

³ "Ὁ ἁγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος οἰκουμενικὸς ἀρχιεπίσκοπος καὶ πατριάρχης Μεννᾶς, κ. τ. λ."—[Ibid. Act. IV. col. 1053.]

that council of Constantinople: and yet, I think, they will not acknowledge the bishops of Constantinople to have had an universal supreme commanding power over the whole world.

Hereunto therefore they add another proof out of the relation of the council of Chalcedon¹ made to Leo; wherein the fathers complain of Dioscorus, that as a wild boar he had violently entered into the vineyard of the Lord, and wasted the same, plucking up the true fruitful vines, and planting unfruitful in their places; and that he stayed not there, but reached out his hand against him to whom the keeping of the vineyard was committed by our Saviour, that is, against the bishop of Rome, whom he thought to excommunicate. These words we willingly confess to be words of just complaint, upon great cause made by the fathers of the council, against Dioscorus: but they prove not the thing in question. For we make no doubt but the keeping of the vineyard of the Lord of hosts was committed to the bishop of Rome, not only as well as to other, but in the first place, as being in order and honour the chief: but that he only received from Christ this power, authority, and charge, and others from him, not we only, but many learned amongst themselves, do deny, as Bellarmine testifieth².

There are two other testimonies that may be alleged out of the council of Chalcedon. For Paschasinus, one of the vicegerents of the bishop of Rome in that council, calleth Rome³ the head of the churches, and Leo⁴ the bishop of

¹ “Καὶ ἦν ἂν ὁ ἀντικείμενος ὡς θῆρ ἔξω τῆς μάδρας καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ὠρυόμενος, . . . καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἅπασιν ἔτι κατ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου τὴν φυλάκην παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐπιτετραμμένην τὴν μανίαν ἐξέτεινε, λέγομεν δὴ τῆς σῆς ὁσιότητος.”—Relat. Concil. Chalced. ad Leon. Act. xvi. [Labbe, col. 1776.]

² “Quæstio est an episcopi canonice electi accipiunt a Deo suam jurisdictionem, sicut eam accipit summus pontifex, an vero a pontifice.”—Bellarm. de Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 22. [Tom. i. p. 429.]

³ “Πασχασῖνος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος φύλαξ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου, ὡς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ μετὰ καὶ τῶν συνελθόντων αὐτῷ, ἔφη· Τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἀποστολικοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως, κεφαλῆς ὑπάρχοντος πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, προστάξεις ἔχομεν, κ.τ.λ.”—Concil. Chalced. Act. i. [Labbe, col. 864.]

⁴ “Sanctissimus et beatissimus papa, caput universalis ecclesiæ, Leo, &c.”—In Exempl. Epist. Paschasini. In Concil. Chalced. Bin. Tom. ii. p. 141. [Vid. Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1303.]

Rome, head of the universal church. But they who press so much the saying of the pope's legate in favour of the pope, must know, that by head he meant chief in order and honour, and not one having all power originally in himself, and absolutely commanding over all, as the papists now teach. For if he had meant so, he had not been endured by the fathers of that council, who peremptorily pronounce¹, that it was the greatness of the city, and not any power given by Christ or derived to him from Peter, that made the bishop of Rome to be great; and that therefore they would equal the bishop of Constantinople unto him, seeing Constantinople was now become equal unto Rome.

The next testimony that they allege is out of the patriarchal council of Constantinople² under Mennas, wherein the fathers profess by Mennas their president, that they follow and obey the apostolic see, that they communicate with them with whom that see communicateth, and condemn all those it condemneth. Surely, this reason, howsoever it may seem to have some force, yet indeed hath none at all. For there is no question, but that the bishop of Rome, with his western synods, all which, according to the phrase of antiquity, are comprehended under the name of the apostolic see, was more to be esteemed than the particular synod under Mennas: and that therefore they might profess to follow it, and obey the decrees of it; and yet neither think the pope to be universal bishop, nor that the bishop of Rome, with his western bishops, is more to be listened unto and obeyed than all the other bishops of the Christian world. That Adrian³, the bishop of Rome, in his epistle to Tharasius, inserted into the seventh

¹ “Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασιν τὰ πρεσβεῖα· καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ῥν'. θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ.”—Concil. Chalced. Act. xv. [Labbe, col. 1692.]

² “Ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ ἐξακολουθοῦμεν τε καὶ πειθόμεθα, καὶ τοὺς κοινωνικοὺς αὐτοῦ κοινωνικοὺς ἔχομεν, καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατακριθέντας καὶ ἡμεῖς κατακρίνομεν.”—Concil. Constant. sub Menna. Act. iv. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 1057.]

³ “Ὁὖ [Πέτρου] ὁ θρόνος εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην πρωτεύων διαλάμπει· καὶ κεφαλὴ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχει.”—Hadrian. Epist. ad Tharas. in Concil. vii. [Nicæn. ii.] Act. ii. [Labbe, Tom. viii. col. 772.]

general council, saith, that the see of Rome hath the primacy throughout the whole world, and is the head of all Churches (which is the last allegation of Bellarmine out of councils), is no more than we granted before, if it be rightly understood of a primacy of order and honour, and not of an universal, supreme, commanding power over all.

This is all that Bellarmine can allege out of any ancient council: in which his allegations it will not be amiss for the reader to observe his guileful cunning; who undertaking to produce the testimonies of ancient councils for confirmation of the papacy, bringeth nothing for the most part but the words of particular men, and they either suitors to the pope, agents for him, or popes. To that which he hath out of later councils, as that of Lateran under Innocentius, and that of Lyons, and Florence, I will answer when I come to show the opinions of later times touching the pope's universality of jurisdiction and power; and therefore will pass them over in this place.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

OF THE PRETENDED PROOFS OF THE POPE'S JURISDICTION
TAKEN OUT OF THE DECRETAL EPISTLES OF POPES.

THE next proofs that are brought for confirmation of the universality of papal jurisdiction, are the sayings of popes in their decretal epistles. These epistles Bellarmine¹ sorteth into three ranks, placing in the first the epistles of those

¹ "Tertium argumentum sumitur a summorum pontificum sententiis. Est autem observandum epistolas pontificum in tres quasi classes distribui posse.

"Prima classis continet epistolas pontificum qui sederunt usque ad annum 300. Secunda classis complectitur epistolas eorum pontificum qui sederunt ab anno 600, usque ad nostra tempora.

"Tertia classis comprehendit illas epistolas in quibus et aperte asseritur primatus, et quas constat esse scriptas a sanctis et veris pontificibus, qui floruerunt ab anno 300 ad 600.

"Ad hæc testimonia nihil respondent, nisi esse recentia et supposititia. At quamvis aliquos errores in eas irrepsisse non negaverim, nec indubitatas esse affirmare audeam; certe tamen antiquissimas esse nihil dubito."—Bellarm. De Pontif. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 14. [Tom. I. p. 316.]

popes that lived within the first three hundred years: in the second, the epistles of those that lived after the first six hundred years: and in the third, the epistles of such as came in the midst between these.

Touching the first, he confesseth, that certain errors have crept into them, and that he dareth not pronounce them to be indubitate; but cardinal Cusanus, a man of great learning, reading, and judgment, minceth not the matter as Bellarmine doth, but plainly and in direct words professeth that he thinketh these epistles that go under the names of ancient popes are counterfeit. His words are these¹: "In my opinion the things that are written of Constantine and his donation are apocryphal, as also perhaps some other long and large writings attributed to the holy men Clemens and Anacletus the pope, on which they that desire to magnify the Roman see, which is worthy of all honour, and to exalt it more than is expedient for the Church, or is any way fit, do either altogether or in some sort ground themselves. For, assuredly, if any man would diligently read over and peruse all the writings attributed to those holy men, and compare the times wherein they lived with those writings, and then would be conversant in the works of all the holy fathers, which were till the time of Augustine, Hierome, and Ambrose; and in the books of councils, wherein authentical writings are

¹ "Sunt meo iudicio illa de Constantino apocrypha, sicut fortassis etiam quædam alia longa et magna scripta sanctis Clementi et Anacleto papæ attributa. In quibus volentes Romanam sedem omni laude dignam plusquam ecclesiæ sanctæ expedit et decet exaltare, se penitus aut quasi fundant. Si quis illas omnes scripturas illis sanctis attributas diligenter perlegeret, et eorum tempora ad illa scripta applicaret, ac deinde in opusculis omnium sanctorum patrum qui usque ad Augustinum, Hieronymum, et Ambrosium fuere, ac etiam de gestis conciliorum, ubi authentica scripta allegantur usum et memoriam haberet; hoc inveniret verum, quia nec in illis omnibus scripturis de illis præfatis epistolis mentio habetur, et etiam ipsæ epistolæ applicatæ ad tempus eorum sanctorum seipsas produnt. Scribitur in Clementis epistolis, quomodo papa fuerit et Petri successor, et post Petri mortem ad sanctum Jacobum has fingit scriptor misisse epistolas qui fuit frater Domini et Hierosolymorum episcopus, et est manifestum Jacobum prius Petro octo annis finisse martyrio vitam. Et hæc una de causis, cur inter catholicas epistolas ea quæ Jacobi sunt præcedunt, ut scribit Beda super Canonicis epistolis in principio."—Cusan. Concord. Cathol. Lib. III. cap. 2. [p. 782. Bas. 1565.]

alleged, committing them to memory, and making use of them, he would find this to be true, that neither any mention is made of those forenamed epistles in any of those writings, nor that the epistles compared with the times wherein their supposed authors lived, can be made to agree with the times of their life; but by the very circumstance of time bewray themselves to be counterfeit. It is written in the epistles of Clemens, how he was made pope and succeeded Peter; and after the death of Peter, the author of these epistles writeth unto James, who was brother of our Lord and bishop of Jerusalem; and yet it is most manifest that the same James died eight years before Peter, which was one of the causes (as Beda writeth in his commentaries upon the canonical epistles) why the Epistle of James is set first among the catholic epistles." Neither is this the censure of Cusanus only, but Contius¹, a learned canonist, in his annotations upon Gratian, feareth not to pronounce all the decretal epistles, that go under the names of such bishops as lived before Sylvester, to be false and counterfeit.

Besides these censures of learned men, there want not strong and effectual reasons to disprove these epistles. For first, they will easily appear to be counterfeit, because they are barbarously and rudely written, and are not like the writings of those men that lived in the times wherein the supposed authors of those epistles did live, but like the writings of such as lived in later and worse times, after barbarism had prevailed and overflowed all. Secondly, because the style is so different from those indubitate remainders of the epistles of the same popes, found in Cyprian², Eusebius³, and Athanasius⁴, that they cannot be but counterfeit: for whosoever shall compare them, shall find them to differ as much as gold and dross. Thirdly, for that all these supposed epistles are so like one another in style, and oftentimes have the very same sentences, that it is very likely they came all from one and the same forge. Fourthly, because neither Eusebius, Hierome, nor any other ancient writer, maketh any mention of them. Fifthly,

¹ Contius, Annot. in Dist. xxvi. cap. 70.

² Cyprian. Epist. xlv. et xlviii. In edit. Pamel. [Al. xlix. et l. pp. 92, 94. Oxon. 1682.]

³ Euseb. H. E. Lib. vi. cap. 42.

⁴ Athanas. Apolog. ii. [Tom. i. p. 141.]

because they follow not the old translation in their allegations of scripture, but that of Hierome, which was not in being in those times wherein the supposed authors of these epistles did live. Lastly, which is the reason before used by Cusanus¹, because the epistle to James, written after the death of Peter, as appeareth in the front of it, and so consequently after the twelfth year of Nero, could not be written to James the brother of our Lord, who, as Hierome² testifieth, was slain at Jerusalem in the seventh year of Nero. But whatsoever become of the censure of learned men branding these epistles with the note of forgery, and the reasons brought to disprove them, which cannot easily be answered: yet Bellarmine will prove that these epistles are mentioned by the ancient, and consequently that the Century writers³ say untruly, that hardly any shall be found before the time of Charles the Great that speaketh any thing of them⁴. To this purpose he produceth Isidore, in his preface before his collection of the councils, affirming that he gathered canons out of the epistles of Clemens, Anacletus, Evaristus, and the rest of the Roman bishops, by the advice of eighty bishops; but this is to justify one counterfeit by another; for this preface is thought to be counterfeit, because in it there is mention made of the sixth general council under Agatho, whereas Isidore was dead forty years before the holding of that council. Wherefore he allegeth the council of Vase, as mentioning the same decretals. But the decrees of that council are uncertain, as Binius⁵

¹ Loco citato [P. 280, supra.] Vide etiam Binium in Annot. in Epist. Clement. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 98.]

² "Triginta annos Hierosolymorum rexit ecclesiam, id est, usque ad septimum Neronis annum."—Hieron. In Catal. Script. Eccles. [Al. De Vir. Illustr.] In Jacobo. [Tom. ii. col. 819.]

³ "Nec facile reperias has epistolas ab ullo patrum aut fide digno auctore ab hoc seculo usque ad Caroli Magni ætatem citari."—Cent. Magdeb. Cent. ii. cap. 7. ad fin. [Tom. ii. col. 116. Bas. 1624.]

⁴ "Mentiuntur Magdeburgenses, cum dicunt nullum fide dignum auctorem citasse has epistolas ante tempora Caroli Magni. Nam Isidorus qui 200 annis antiquior est Carolo in proem. sui collect. sac. Can., dicit se ex consilio 80 episcoporum collegisse canones ex epistolis Clementis Anacleti, Evaristi, et cæterorum Romanorum pontificum. Item concilium Vasense can. 6. citat epistolas Clementis, ut nunc exstant."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

⁵ "Sicut acta et decreta hujus concilii propter miram canonum

noteth, by reason of the great confusion that is found in them: and truly, I think, there is no man that can make any sense of that which is cited out of Clement's epistles by that council. Therefore in the third place he addeth Ruffinus, who in his preface before his translation of the Recognitions of Clemens out of Greek, speaketh of an epistle of Clement unto James the brother of our Lord, and saith he turned it out of Greek into Latin: and this, saith Bellarmine, which we have, is undoubtedly the same that he translated, as may be proved out of Gennadius¹: therefore the epistle that is now carried about under the name of Clemens is ancient, and not late or counterfeit. But that these Philistines may fall by their own sword, we will oppose against Bellarmine the cardinal, Baronius the cardinal, against the Roman reader of controversies, the Roman annalist. For Baronius² proveth out of Gennadius³, whom Bellarmine allegeth, that these epistles we have are not the same that Ruffinus translated, because those he translated had prefaces before them, but this of Clement hath none. Thus we see the epistles of the popes of the first three hundred years prove nothing, because they are counterfeit.

Of them that were written by such as lived after the first six hundred years, I shall have a fit opportunity to speak in another place. Wherefore let us come to those of the middle rank, where Bellarmine produceth twelve ancient bishops of Rome, claiming that supreme, absolute, and

confusionem incerta sunt, ita quam ob causam celebratum sit certo affirmari nequit.—Bin. Annot. ad Concil. Vasens. ii. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 721.]

¹ “Denique Ruffinus qui annis 400 præcessit Carolum, præfat. in recognit. Clement. a se conversas ex Græco, meminit Epistolæ Clementis ad Jacobum, et eam se vertisse dicit ex Græco. Esse autem vere hanc versionem Ruffini testatur Gennadius, Lib. de Vir. Illustr. in Ruffino.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² “Gennadius de Ruffino agens in cunctis se e Græco editis versionibus præfationem imponere testatur; adeo ut quæ sine prologo reperiuntur esse translata, non Ruffini sed alterius esse opus affirmet.”—Baron. Anno Dom. 102. num. 6. [Tom. ii. p. 13. Antv. 1617.]

³ “Horum omnium quæcunque præmissis prologis a Latinis leguntur a Ruffino interpretata sunt, quæ autem sine prologo ab alio translata sunt qui prologum facere noluit.”—Gennad. de Viris Illustr. cap. 17. [Inter Opp. Hieron. Tom. ii. col. 960.] Citat. etiam in Annot. Binii ad Epist. i. Clement. ad Jacobum. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 98.]

commanding authority over the whole Church, which we deny.

The first of the twelve is Julius the First¹, in his epistle extant in the second Apology of Athanasius. The witness is good, and we will not except against him; but he deposeth directly against them that produce him; neither is there any better evidence to be desired than this his epistle. For the

¹ “Τί γὰρ καὶ γέγονεν ἄξιον λύπης, ἢ ἐν τίνι ἦν ἄξιον λυπηθῆναι ὑμᾶς οἷς καὶ ἐγράψαμεν; ἢ ὅτι προσετρεψάμεθα εἰς σύνοδον ἀπαντῆσαι; ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἔδει μετὰ χαρᾶς δέξασθαι. Οἱ γὰρ παρρησίαν ἔχοντες ἐφ’ οἷς πεποιήκασι, καὶ ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσι κεκρίκασιν, οὐκ ἀγανακτοῦσιν, εἰ παρ’ ἐτέρων ἐξετάζοιτο ἡ κρίσις, ἀλλὰ θαρρόουσιν, ὅτι ἂν δικαίως ἐκρίνον ταῦτα ἄδικοι οὐκ ἂν ποτε γένοιτο. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νίκαιαν μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ συνελθόντες ἐπίσκοποι οὐκ ἄνευ θεοῦ βουλήσεως συνεχώρησαν ἐν ἐτέρᾳ συνόδῳ τὰ τῆς προτέρας ἐξετάζεσθαι.

“Οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν τῶν περὶ Εὐσεβίου ἀποσταλέντες μετὰ γραμμάτων, λέγω δὴ Μακάριος ὁ πρεσβύτερος καὶ Μαρτύριος καὶ Ἡσύχιος οἱ διάκονοι ἀπαντήσαντες ἐνταῦθα, ὡς οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλθόντας Ἀθανασίου πρεσβυτέρους ἀντιστῆναι, ἀλλ’ ἐν πᾶσι διετρέποντο καὶ διηλέγοντο, τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἠξίωσαν ἡμᾶς ὥστε σύνοδον συγκροτῆσαι, καὶ γράψαι καὶ Ἀθανασίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ εἰς Ἀλεξανδρείαν, γράψαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς περὶ Εὐσέβιον ἵνα ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ πάντων ἡ δικαία κρίσις ἐξενεχθῇ δυνήθῃ.

“Εἰ τοίνυν μηδὲ τῶν περὶ Μαρτύριον καὶ Ἡσύχιον ἀξιωσάντων γίνεσθαι σύνοδον προτρεψάμενος ἡμῖν ἔγω σκύλαι τοὺς γράψαντας, ἕνεκεν τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν αἰτιωμένων ἀδικίαν πεπονθέναι καὶ οὕτως εὐλογος ἦν καὶ δικαία ἡ προτροπή, ἔστι γὰρ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ καὶ θεῷ ἀρέσκουσα.

“Τίνες οὖν εἰσὶν οἱ σύνοδον ἀτιμάζοντες; οὐχὶ οἱ τῶν τριακοσίων τὰς ψήφους παρ’ οὐδὲν θέμενοι, καὶ ἀσέβειαν εὐσεβείας προκρίναντες;

“Ἀθανάσιος δὲ ἐμαρτυρήθη μηδὲ ἐν Τύρῳ καταγνωσθεὶς, ἐν δὲ τῷ Μαρεώτῃ μὴ παρῆναι ἔνθα τὰ ὑπομνήματα κατ’ αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι λέγεται.

“Ἀθανάσιος δὲ καὶ Μάρκελλος οἱ ἐπίσκοποι πλείονας ἔχουσι τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν λέγοντας καὶ γράφοντας... Ὅμως τούτων ὄντων ἡμεῖς, ὑπὲρ ἀκριβείας, οὔτε ὑμῖν οὔτε τοῖς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γράψασιν πρόκριμα ποιῶντες προετρεψάμεθα τοὺς γράψαντας ἐλθεῖν, ἵν’ ἐπειδὴ πλείους εἰσὶν οἱ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γράψαντες ἐπὶ συνόδῳ πάντα ἐξετασθῇ.

“Ὅμως δὲ γνώρισαι ὑμῖν ἀναγκαῖον ὅτι εἰ καὶ μόνος ἔγραψα, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐμοῦ μόνου ἐστὶν αὕτη ἡ γνώμη, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν, καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις τοῖς μέρεσιν ἐπισκόπων.

“Ἐπίσκοποι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ πάσχοντες, καὶ οὐχ αἱ τυχοῦσαι ἐκκλησίαι αἱ πάσχουσιν, ἀλλ’ ὧν αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι δι’ ἑαυτῶν καθηγήσαντο. Διατὶ δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας μάλιστα οὐκ ἐγράφετο ἡμῖν; ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὀρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια... Οὐχ οὕτως αἱ Παύλου διατάξεις, οὐχ’ οὕτως οἱ πατέρες παραδεδώκασιν, ἄλλος τύπος ἐστὶν οὗτος, καὶ καινὸν τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα.”—Julii Epist. In Apolog. Athanas. [Tom. i. pp. 142, 153.]

bishops of the East having written to Julius, and blamed him for communicating with such as they rejected, and going about to reverse the acts which they had agreed on; and having told him, that the greatness of cities maketh not the power of bishops to be the greater; and that therefore he should not take on him to be greater than other bishops, and to undo that which they had done, because he was bishop of a greater city than any of them was: he answereth modestly in this his epistle, that he hopeth he offendeth not in desiring them to come to a synod, that therein their proceedings might be examined; seeing the Nicene council appointeth the acts of one council to be re-examined in another. Secondly, he showeth, that they whom they sent to inform him and the western bishops touching their proceedings against Athanasius, being convicted by the presbyters of Athanasius, desired him to call a council of his own bishops, and to write to Athanasius, and those of Eusebius' part, to come unto the same; wherein they doubted not but they should prove the things they had alleged. Thirdly, he showeth that if without the solicitation of their agents he had desired them to meet in council, it had been no fault, nor any way prejudicial unto them. Fourthly, that they who will not have their proceedings re-examined condemn councils, by admitting such as were condemned by the Nicene council; that Athanasius was not condemned at Tyrus; that he was not present when he was condemned at Mareotta; and that many wrote in his defence to him and the other bishops of the West; and that yet he forejudged nothing, but would have had matters defined in a council. Fifthly, he showeth that though he wrote alone, yet he reporteth not his own opinion only, but of all the bishops of Italy, and the countries thereabout. Lastly, he telleth them, that the bishops they proceeded against being no vulgar persons, but bishops of such Churches as the apostles themselves planted, before they had proceeded against them, they should first have written to him and his colleagues, that from thence might have been defined what was right and good; than which course what could be more fitting? For Athanasius bishop of the second see, with other his adherents, were not to be judged by bishops of an inferior rank, especially in a matter concerning the faith, without first consulting the bishop of the first see and his colleagues, that from thence an action of such consequence might

take beginning. And therefore Julius rightly telleth the oriental bishops, that in their rash proceeding against so great and worthy a bishop as was Athanasius, they had offended against the ordinations of Paul; that the fathers had not taught them so to do; and that he had received otherwise from blessed Peter. Here is nothing found, for any thing I see, that any way proveth the pope to have a supreme commanding power over the whole Church; but rather the contrary. For he doth nothing without the synod of the western bishops; he challengeth not the right of judging the causes of the oriental bishops, either by himself alone, or with his synod of western bishops; much less deriveth the claim of any such right from Peter; as the Jesuit untruly misreporteth the matter; but thinketh that the final and supreme judging of them pertaineth to a general council.

The next allegation is out of an epistle of Damasus¹, wherein writing to the bishops of the East, he commendeth them that they gave due reverence to the see apostolic, and calleth them sons. To what purpose this allegation serveth, I know not. For if any man do think it consequent, that the pope hath an universal commanding power over all, because the bishops of the East yielded a kind of due respect and reverence to the see apostolic, (that is, to the bishop of Rome, and his colleagues,) for that it was in order and honour the first see; he is greatly deceived, and may be confuted out of the epistle of the oriental bishops², in answer whereof Damasus writeth. For they write unto him, not as to their lord and commander, but as to their brother and colleague; and direct not their letters to him only, but to him and the other bishops of the West. Their epistle beginneth in this sort: "To their brethren and colleagues, Damasus, Ambrose, Brito, Valerianus, Ascholius, &c., and the rest of the holy bishops assembled in the great city of Rome." Where, by the way, we may observe, that howsoever Damasus call them sons, as being bishops

¹ "Ὅτι τῇ ἀποστολικῇ καθέδρᾳ τὴν ὀφειλομένην αἰδῶ ἢ ἀγάπῃ ὑμῶν ἀπονέμει, ἑαυτοῖς τὸ πλεῖστον παρέχετε, υἱοὶ τιμιώτατοι."—Epist. Damas. Apud Theodoret. H. E. v. 9. [Al. 10.]

² "Κυρίοις τιμιωτάτοις καὶ εὐλαβεστάτοις ἀδελφοῖς καὶ συλλειτουργοῖς Δαμάσῳ, Ἀμβροσίῳ, Βρίττῳ, Οὐαλεριανῷ, Ἀσχολίῳ, Ἀνεμίῳ, Βασιλείῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἁγίοις ἐπισκόποις τοῖς συνεληλυθόσιν ἐν τῇ μεγαλοπόλει Ῥώμῃ."—Apud Theodoret. [v. 9.]

of meaner places, and inferior sees, yet they call him brother and colleague, as being equal in office and power, though inferior in order and honour. Besides this, they refused to come to Rome, though earnestly entreated by Damasus so to do, but stayed at Constantinople, and there held a council, wherein they condemned the heresies of the Eunomians and Macedonians; ordained sundry bishops, as the bishops of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem, Nectarius, Flavianus, and Cyril; they made the bishop of Constantinople a patriarch, and set him in degree of honour next unto the bishop of Rome¹. These ordinations of Nectarius and Flavianus especially Damasus liked not, and yet was forced to give way unto them, and to yield to the bishops assembled at Constantinople (being but an hundred and fifty in number) the name of the general council; though about the same time he and all the bishops of the West were assembled at Rome; wherefore this testimony might well have been spared. The next allegation out of the epistle of Damasus² to the bishops of Numidia, is less to be esteemed than the former; seeing that epistle hath many things in it which cannot agree with the state of things in those times. For if the Africans had been so willing to refer all greater matters by way of appeal to Rome, as the epistle of Stephen, in answer whereunto this of Damasus is written, importeth; how could it have come to pass that in Zosimus his time appeals to Rome should seem so strange as it appeareth they did?

That which is alleged out of the epistle of Siricius to Himericus³ bishop of Tarracon, and of Zosimus to Hesychius bishop of Salona⁴, is to little purpose; for that Siricius saith,

¹ Vide notas Binii in Concil. Constantin. I. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1151.]

² "Cuncta quæ possunt aliquam recipere dubitationem ad nos tanquam ad caput, ut semper fuit consuetudo, deferre non desinatis."—Epist. Damasi ad Episc. Numid. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1025.]

³ "Portamus onera omnium qui gravantur. Quinimo hoc portat in vobis B. apostolus Petrus, qui nos in omnibus, ut confidimus, administrationis suæ protegit, et tuetur hæredes.

"Explicavimus, ut arbitror, frater carissime, universa quæ digesta sunt in querelam, et ad singulas causas de quibus per filium nostrum Bassianum presbyterum ad Romanam ecclesiam, utpote ad caput tui corporis retulisti, &c."—Epist. Siricii ad Himericum Episc. Tarracon. [Labbe, Tom. II. coll. 1213, 7.]

⁴ "Ad te potissimum scripta direximus, quæ in omnium fratrum et

he is more zealous of true religion than all other Christians, and that he beareth the burthen of all that are grieved, is no more than is attributed to Athanasius bishop of Alexandria¹. Neither is it to be marvelled at, that he saith, the bishop of Tarracon referred certain matters to the Church of Rome, as to the head of his body, seeing he was one of the bishops that were subject to the bishop of Rome, as patriarch of the West. Which also is the reason why Zosimus giveth directions to the bishop of Salona touching the time they of the clergy were to continue in every of the lower degrees, before they might be preferred to higher, wishing him to acquaint others near unto him with the same, and to assure them that he should answer it with the loss of his place, whosoever should contemn the authority of the fathers, and neglect his prescriptions.

The next pope that is produced as a witness is Innocentius the First², in his epistles to the bishops of Macedonia, and the fathers assembled in the councils of Milevis and Carthage³, out of which epistles four things are alleged for proof of the pope's supremacy. The first is, that the Church of Rome is by him called head of Churches, yea, the wellspring and head

episcoporum nostrorum facies ire notitiam. . . . Sciet quisquis hoc, post posita patrum et apostolicæ sedis auctoritate neglexerit, a nobis distractius vindicandum, ut loci sui minime dubitet sibi non constare rationem si hoc putat post tot prohibitiones posse tentari.—Epist. Zosimi ad Hesych. Episc. Salon. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 400.]

¹ “Οὐδένα τοσοῦτον ἡγοῦμαι λυπεῖν τὴν παροῦσαν τῶν ἐκκλησίῳν κατάστασιν, μᾶλλον δὲ σύγχυσιν, εἰπεῖν ἀληθέστερον, ὅσον τὴν σὴν τιμιότητα. . . . Ὅτι ὀφείλεις, κατὰ τοὺς σοφωτάτους τῶν ἱατρῶν, τῆς ἐπιμελείας ἐκ τῶν καιριωτάτων ἄρχεσθαι, πάντος ἀκριβέστερον αὐτὸς ἐπίστασαι. Τί δ' ἂν γένοιτο ταῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἐπικαιριώτερον;”—Basil. Epist. xlviii. [Al. lxvi. Tom. III. p. 158.]

² “Adverti sedi apostolicæ ad quam relatio quasi ad caput ecclesiarum missa currebat, fieri injuriam, &c.”—Innocent. Epist. xxii. ad Episc. Maced. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 32.]

³ “Diligenter et congrue apostolico consulitis honori. Honori, inquam, illius quem præter illa quæ extrinsecus sunt sollicitudo manet omnium ecclesiarum; antiquæ scilicet regulæ formam secuti, quam toto semper ab orbe mecum nostis esse servatum.”—Id. Inter Epist. August. xciii. [Al. clxxxii. Tom. II. col. 639.]

“Ad nostrum referendum approbastis esse judicium, scientes quid apostolicæ sedi, cum omnes hoc loco positi ipsum sequi desideremus apostolum, debeat, a quo ipse episcopatus et tota auctoritas nominis hujus emersit.”—Id. Epist. xci. [Al. clxxxi. col. 635.]

of all Churches. The second, that doubtful cases were referred to the see of Rome by the bishops of Macedonia. The third, that all the bishops of the world were wont to consult the Roman bishop, in doubtful questions touching matters of faith. The fourth, that the Roman bishops have the care of all Churches. To these several objections, framed out of the epistles of this Roman bishop, we answer briefly: first, that the Church of Rome was head of all Churches; that is, first in order and honour amongst them, but not in absolute supreme commanding power. Secondly, that the Church of Rome was in more special sort head of such Churches as were within the patriarchship of Rome (as Macedonia was in Innocentius his time); and that this was the reason why the bishops of Macedonia referred their doubts to the determination of the see of Rome. Thirdly, that all the bishops of the world consulted the apostolic see of Rome, and the bishop thereof, in controversies of faith and religion, not as an absolute supreme judge, to whose determinations they were bound to stand, but as their most honourable colleague, interested as much as any of them in the maintenance of the truth of religion, and the determination of things questioned concerning the faith. Fourthly, that they did not consult the person of the bishop of Rome alone, but all the bishops of the West together with him, who were a great and principal part of the Christian world, though sometimes he only be named, as being the president of all the synods of bishops throughout the West. Fifthly, that the bishops of Rome had the care of all Churches, not as absolute supreme commanders, but as most honourable amongst the bishops and pastors of Churches; who were first to be sought unto in matters requiring a common deliberation, and from whom all things generally concerning the state of the whole Church were either to take beginning, or at the least to seek confirmation before they were generally imposed and prescribed; that so being rightly determined by the bishops of the chief and principal Churches, other Churches might receive the same, like waters flowing from a fountain, and running in purity in all Churches, according to the purity of the head and beginning.

The sixth bishop of Rome that is produced to give testimony for the pope's supremacy is Leo the First, out of whom seven things are alleged: whereof the first is, that he ap-

pointed Anastasius¹, the bishop of Thessalonica, to be his vicerent for the government of the provinces far off from him : whence it may be inferred, as our adversaries think, that the bishops of Rome had an universal commanding power over all the world. The second, that he commandeth Anatolius² patriarch of Constantinople. The third, that he wisheth the bishop of Antioch³ to write often to him touching the affairs and state of the Churches. The fourth, that Cyril⁴, the patriarch of Alexandria, besought him not to permit Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, to prejudice the right of the Church of Antioch, and to subject Palestina to himself. The fifth, that he commanded Dioscorus⁵ bishop of Alexandria. The sixth, that he

¹ "Sicut præcessores mei præcessoribus tuis, ita etiam ego dilectioni tuæ priorum secutus exemplum vices mei moderaminis delegavi, ut curam quam universis ecclesiis principaliter ex divina institutione debemus imitator nostræ mansuetudinis adjuvares, et longinquis a nobis provinciis præsentiam quodammodo nostræ visitationis impenderes."—Leo, Epist. lxxxiv. [Al. xiv. ad Anastasium, Tom. i. col. 683.]

² "Hanc regulam mementote servandam, ut quicumque in illa synodo quæ nomen synodi nec habere poterit nec meretur et in qua malevolentiam suam Dioscorus, imperitiam autem Juvenalis ostendit, dolent, ut dilectionis tuæ relatione comperimus, se metu victos, et terrore superatos ad consensum scelestissimi judicii potuisse compelli, et communionem catholicam obtinere desiderant, satisfactioni eorum pax fraterna præstetur; ita ut non dubiis professionibus Eutychen cum suo dogmate cumque consortibus suis anathematis execratione condemnent."—Epist. xlvi. [Al. lxxxv. ad Anatolium Episcopum Constantinopolitanum, col. 1051.]

³ "Cum aliquid pro Antiochenæ ecclesiæ privilegiis dilectio tua agendum esse crediderit, propriis litteris studeat explicare, ut nos consultationi tuæ absolute et congrue respondere possimus."—Epist. lxii. [Al. cxix. ad Maximum Antiochenum Episcopum, col. 1214.]

⁴ "In Ephesina synodo quæ impium Nestorium cum dogmate suo perculit Juvenalis episcopus ad obtinendum Palestinæ provinciæ principatum credidit se posse proficere, et insolentes ausus per commentitia scripta firmare. Quod sanctæ memoriæ Cyrillus Alexandrinus episcopus merito perhorrescens scriptis suis mihi quid prædicti cupiditas ausa esset indicavit; et sollicita prece multum poposcit, ut nulla illicitis conatibus præberetur assensio."—Ibid. [col. 1216.]

⁵ "Cum beatissimus Petrus apostolicum a Domino acceperit principatum, et Romana in ejus permaneant institutis, nefas est credere quod sanctus discipulus ejus Marcus qui Alexandrinam primus ecclesiam gubernaverit aliis regulis traditionum suarum decreta formaverit; cum sine dubio de eodem fonte gratiæ unus spiritus et discipuli fuerit et magistri, nec aliud ordinatus tradere potuerit quam quod ab ordinatore

intermeddled in Africa¹. And the last, that he saith, that Rome² had a larger extent of precedence, in that by Peter's chair she was made the head of all Churches, than in that in respect of earthly dominion she was lady and mistress of a great part of the world. To all these objections, thus mustered together out of the writings of Leo, we answer in this sort. First, that Thessalonica was within the patriarchship of Rome, and that therefore the bishop of Rome might have a vicegerent there, to despatch some of those things that pertained to him as patriarch, and yet have no universal commanding power over all the world. Secondly, we say, that Leo did not acknowledge Anatolius bishop of Constantinople to be a patriarch, and that therefore it followeth not, that he would have presumed to have commanded a patriarch, if he had commanded him; but that indeed he did not command him. For thus the case stood³. After the council of Ephesus, wherein divers bishops, compelled by Dioscorus, subscribed to impious decrees, Leo besought the emperor that a general council might be called; but because by reason of wars in many parts of the world, such a council could not conveniently be presently called, he sent certain commissioners to Constantinople, who taking to them the bishop of Constantinople, and being assisted by him and the bishops thereabout, might, upon repentance and due satisfaction, reconcile and again admit to the communion of their Churches such as they

suscepit. Non ergo patimur, ut cum unius nos esse corporis et fidei fateamur, in aliquo discrepemus; et alia doctoris, alia discipuli instituta videantur."—Epist. lxxxi. [Al. ix. ad Dioscorum, col. 628.]

¹ "Cum de ordinationis sacerdotum quædam apud vos illicite usurpata crebrior ad nos commeantium sermo perferret, ratio pietatis exegit ut pro sollicitudine quam universæ ecclesiæ ex divina institutione dependimus rerum fidem studeremus agnoscere, &c.

"Causam quoque Lupicini episcopi illic jubemus audiri, cui multum et sæpius postulanti communionem hac ratione reddidimus, quoniam cum ad nostram judicium provocasset, immerito eum pendente negotio a communione videbamus fuisse suspensum, &c."—Epist. lxxxvii. [Al. xii. coll. 658, 668.]

² "Isti sunt [præcipui apostoli] qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt, ut gens sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia, per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsideres religione divina quam dominatione terrena."—Serm. i. In Natal. Apost. [Serm. lxxxii. Tom. i. col. 321.]

³ Vid. Epist. xlv. Leonis. [Citat. p. 290, not. 2.]

should think fit. These commissioners Leo directed and commanded, as in right he might: but that he specially commanded the bishop of Constantinople, it cannot be proved. Thirdly, we say, that Leo in brotherly sort wished the bishop of Antioch to resist heretics; and to let him understand of the state of the Churches, and to be a consort of the apostolic see in this care: to see that the privileges of the third see were not diminished by any man's ambition, assuring him, that whensoever he will do any thing for the advancing of the dignity of the see of Antioch, he also will be ready to concur with him. In all which passages between Leo and the bishop of Antioch there is nothing found that hath any show of proof of the pope's supremacy. Fourthly, we say that Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, besought Leo to give no consent to the attempts of Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, seeking to prejudice the Church of Antioch, and to subject Palestina to himself: but that he besought Leo not to permit nor suffer Palestina to be taken from Antioch, and subjected to the Church of Jerusalem (as if the whole power of permitting or hindering this thing had rested in Leo), is but the false report of the cardinal, according to his wonted manner of misalleging authors for the advantage of his cause. So that the disposition of this matter rested not wholly in Leo, but his concurrence with the bishops of Antioch and Alexandria was necessary for the withstanding of the attempts of Juvenal; which his concurrence and help he promised the bishop of Antioch, as we have already heard, and was ever ready to yield the same unto him. Fifthly, we say that Leo did not command Dioscorus the patriarch of Alexandria; but whereas the manner was, when the patriarchs were first elected and ordained, that they should mutually consent one to another, and that he who was newly ordained should send unto the rest his synodal letters, and testimonies of his lawful election and ordination; Dioscorus being newly elected and appointed patriarch of Alexandria, sendeth his synodal letters to Leo bishop of Rome, that so he might give his consent, and receive and embrace him as his fellow-patriarch. Leo, that these beginnings of Dioscorus might be more sure and firm, and nothing wanting to perfection, fatherly, as more ancient, and brotherly, as of the same rank with him, putting him in mind of some differences between their two Churches, about the time of the ordination

of ministers; and for that it seemed not likely unto him, that Mark the scholar of Peter took any other order in this behalf than Peter did, said unto him: "We will have you to observe that which our fathers ever observed;" making this a condition of the allowance and consent he was to yield unto him; and urging the practice of the apostles, saith, he shall do well, if, obeying these apostolical institutions, he shall cause that form of ordination to be kept in the Churches over which God hath set him, which is observed in the Churches of the West, that ministers of the Church may be ordained only on the Lord's day, on which day the creation of the world was begun, in which Christ rose, in which death was destroyed, and life, after which there is no death, took beginning; in which the apostles received from the Lord the trumpet of preaching the gospel, and the ministration of the sacrament of regeneration. Sixthly, we say, that Leo intermeddleth in the Churches of Africa, and requireth some ordained contrary to the canons to be put from their places, tolerateth others, and willet the cause of Lupicinus, a bishop who had appealed unto him, to be heard there, because he was patriarch of the West, and these parts of Africa were within his patriarchship; and that yet this his intermeddling in so particular sort with the affairs of the African Churches, was not very pleasing unto those of Africa, as shall appear by that which followeth. Lastly, we say that the Church of Rome was the head of all Churches in the sense before expressed, and had a precedence of order and honour amongst them; and had in that sort, as Leo truly saith, more subject to it than ever were under the Roman empire: but under any absolute, supreme, commanding power of the Church of Rome, they were not. "But," saith Bellarmine, "if the former testimonies of Leo be avoided, there is one more yet behind so clear and full for the supremacy of the pope, that nothing can be said in answer unto it, in his epistle to Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica." His words are these: "Amongst the most blessed apostles, like in honour, there was a certain difference and distinction of power; and whereas they were equally chosen, yet notwithstanding it was given to one of them to have a pre-eminence amongst the rest; from which form the distinction and difference that is amongst bishops hath taken beginning; and by a most wise disposition it hath been provided, that all without difference shall not

challenge all unto themselves, but that there should be in several provinces several bishops, whose sentence and judgments should be first and chief amongst the brethren; and again, certain other constituted and placed in greater cities, who might take the care of more than the former, by whom the care of the whole Church might flow unto that one seat of Peter, and nothing anywhere might dissent from the head¹." These words truly make a goodly show, and may seem most strongly to prove the supremacy that the popes now challenge: but in very deed they most powerfully overthrow it. For the bishops of Rome will never be persuaded in proportionable sort as is expressed in the words of Leo, to challenge no more in respect of the whole Church than the metropolitan bishops do in respect of their provinces, and the patriarchs in respect of their Churches of a larger extent: for then they must do nothing but accordingly as they shall be swayed by the major part of the voices of the bishops of the Christian Church. For the metropolitan may do nothing in his province, nor the patriarch in his larger extent, but as they shall be directed and swayed by the major part of the voices of their bishops: and yet surely the meaning of Leo was not to give so much to the bishop of Rome, in respect of all Christian bishops, as pertaineth to the metropolitans and patriarchs in respect of their bishops. For the metropolitan is to ordain the bishops of the province, and the patriarch to ordain and confirm the metropolitans by imposition of hands, or mission of the pall: but the pope never had any such power in respect of the patriarchs, who were only to send their synodal epistles to him testifying their faith, as he likewise to them, without expecting any other confirmation than that mutual consent, whereby one of them assured of the right faith and lawful ordination of another, received and embraced each other as fellows and colleagues. So that that care of the universal Church, which

¹ "Inter beatissimos apostolos in similitudine honoris fuit quædam discretio potestatis; et cum omnium par esset electio, uni tamen datum est ut cæteris præemineret. De qua forma episcoporum quoque est orta distinctio; et magna ordinatione provisum est, ne omnes sibi omnia vindicarent, sed essent in singulis provinciis singuli quorum inter fratres haberetur prima sententia; et rursus quidam in majoribus urbibus constituti sollicitudinem susciperent ampliorem, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis ecclesiæ cura conflueret, et nihil usquam a suo capite dissideret."—Epist. lxxxiv. [Al. xiv. col. 691.]

Leo saith floweth together, and cometh up to that one chair of Peter, is to be understood only in respect of things concerning the common faith, and general state of the Church; or of the principal, most eminent, and highest parts and members of the same: none of which things might be proceeded in without the bishop of Rome and his colleagues: but otherwise he was not to intermeddle with inferior persons and causes, within the jurisdiction of other patriarchs, neither immediately, nor upon appeal and complaint.

The seventh Roman bishop brought to testify for the absolute supreme power of popes, is Gelasius: out of whom two things are alleged. The first is, that he saith¹, the see of Peter hath power to loose that which the bishops of other Churches have bound. The second², that it hath power to judge of every Church, and that no Church may judge of the judgment of it. For answer to this testimony of Gelasius, first we say, that the Church of Rome may not meddle with reviewing, re-examining, or reversing the acts of other Churches, proceeding against laymen or inferior clergymen. Secondly, that in the case of a bishop complaining of wrong, by the authority of the council of Sardica³, she might interpose herself, not so as to bring the matter to Rome, there to be heard; but so far forth only as to command and appoint a review to be taken by the bishops of the next bordering province, or at the most to send some commissioners to sit with such second judges. Thirdly, that in cases which con-

¹ "Cuncta per mundum novit ecclesia quoniam quorumlibet sententiis ligata pontificum sedes Beati Petri apostoli jus habeat resolvendi. Utpote quæ de omni ecclesia fas habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare judicio."—Gelas. Epist. ad Episc. Dardan. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 328.]

² "Apostolicæ sedis auctoritas, quæ cunctis sæculis Christianis prælata sit universæ, et canonum serie paternorum et multiplici ratione firmatur."—Id. Epist. ad Anastas. Imper. [col. 311.]

³ "Ἦρρεσεν ἰν' εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος καταγγελλεῖν, καὶ συναθροισθέντες οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τῆς ἐνορίας τῆς αὐτῆς τοῦ βαθμοῦ αὐτὸν ἀποκινήσωσι, καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκκαλεσάμενος καταφύγῃ ἐπὶ τὸν μακαριώτατον τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ βουλευθείη αὐτοῦ διακοῦσαι, δίκαιόν τε εἶναι νομίση ἀνανεώσασθαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξέτασιν τοῦ πράγματος, γράφειν τούτοις τοῖς συνεπισκόποις καταξίωσιν, τοῖς ἀγχιστεύουσιν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ, ἵνα αὐτοὶ ἐπιμελῶς καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἕκαστα διερευνήσωσι, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας πίστιν ψῆφον περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἐξενέγκωσιν."—Conc. Sardic. can. v. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 660.]

cerned the principal patriarchs, whether they were differences between them and their bishops, or between themselves, the chief see, as the principal part of the whole Church, might interpose itself. Neither was this proper to the see of Rome: for other patriarchs likewise of the higher thrones might interpose themselves in matters concerning the patriarchs of inferior thrones: whence it is that Basil writing to Athanasius, bishop of the second see¹, telleth him that the ordering of the Church of Antioch, which was the third see, did pertain to him, and that he was to see to the settling of things there, though the quieting of the whole East required the help of the occidental bishops: and Cyril², in the case of Nestorius not yet fully established, in the right of a patriarch inter-meddled, and proceeded so far as to reject him and his adherents from the communion of the Churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. But the bishop of the inferior thrones might not judge the superior: and therefore John of Antioch³, of the third see, is reprehended and reprov'd for judging Cyril bishop of the second see; and Dioscorus, bishop of the second see, is condemned in the council of Chalcedon⁴, as for other things, so for this among other, that he presumed to judge

¹ “Πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἴσως σοι καὶ πλείονων συνεργίας προσδεῖ, καὶ ἀνάγκη ἀναμένειν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς δύσεως. Ἡ μέντοι τῆς κατὰ Ἀντιοχείαν ἐκκλησίας εὐταξία, προδήλως τῆς σῆς ἡρτηται θεοσεβείας.”—Basil. Epist. xlviii. [Al. lxvi. Tom. iii. p. 158.]

² “Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς τοίνυν παρ’ αὐτοῦ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὥρισε διὰ τῆς παρούσης ἀγιωτάτης συνόδου ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστόριον τοῦ ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος, καὶ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱερατικοῦ.”—Concil. Ephes. [Act. i. Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1077.]

³ “Συνάπτει καταμόνας χαρτίον, καὶ δὴ καθαιρέσεως ὄνομα καὶ ὕβριν προσετρίψατο τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπισκόπῳ Κυρίλλῳ, κ.τ.λ.”—Ibid. [col. 1193.]

⁴ “Quoniam super alias suas nequitias et adversus ipsam apostolicam sedem latravit, et excommunicationis literas adversus sanctissimum et beatissimum papam Leonem facere conatus est, &c.”—Epist. Concil. Chalced. ad Marcian. et Valentin. Act. iii. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1352.]

“Οὗτος ὁ ἀγιώτατος, μᾶλλον δὲ εἰπεῖν, ἀγριώτατος, περὶ πάντα ἐν ἔξει γενόμενος τοῦ παρανομεῖν, οὐδὲν ἡγησάμενος τὸ παρ’ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας καὶ ἀγίας μνήμης Φλανιανοῦ τολμηθὲν, ἐπὶ μείζον τὸ κακὸν τρέπεται. Ἀκοινωνησίαν κατὰ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ ὁσιωτάτου ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης παρασκευάζει.”—Epist. alt. ad Leonem. Act. iii. Concil. ejusd. [col. 1272.]

the first see. So that this is it which Gelasius saith, that the see of Rome, that is, the bishop of Rome, and the bishops of the West, may judge and examine the differences between patriarchs, or between patriarchs and their bishops; but neither so peremptorily nor finally, but that such judgment may be reviewed and re-examined in a general council: and that no other particular Church or see may judge the Church of Rome, seeing every other see is inferior to it; no way denying but that a general council may review, re-examine, and reverse the acts and judgments of the Roman see, as being greater, and of more ample authority. Neither truly can there be any better proof against the pretended supremacy of the popes than this epistle, the circumstances whereof are these. Acatius, bishop of Constantinople, for communicating with certain Eutychian heretics, was by the see of Rome condemned: some disliked his proceeding against him, because a synod was not specially summoned for the purpose, especially seeing he was bishop of the princely city: Gelasius standeth not upon the claim of universal power, thereby to justify his proceeding, but answereth, first, that Eutyches being condemned in the council of Chalcedon, all such were accursed likewise as should either by defence of such error, or communicating with men so erring, fall into the fellowship of the same heresy, and that therefore there needed no synod, but the see apostolic might execute that was there decreed: secondly, that the catholic bishops in the East being deposed, and heretics thrust into their places, there was no reason why he should have consulted with them: thirdly, that he did nothing of himself, but with a synod of the western bishops.

The next four bishops produced by the cardinal, are John the Second, Anastasius the Second, Felix the Fourth, and Pelagius the Second; out of whom he allegeth nothing but this, that the see of Peter holdeth the chieftly assigned of the Lord in the universal Church, and that the Church of Rome is the head of all Churches. Whereunto we briefly answer, that the see of Peter ever held the chieftly, and that the Church of Rome was ever the head of all Churches, not in universality of absolute supreme power and commanding authority, but in order and honour in sort before expressed: and that by the see of Peter and Church of Rome is meant the whole West Church, and not precisely the diocese of Rome, as likewise we

have noted before : and therefore these allegations to prove the pope's supremacy over all bishops, are nothing to the purpose.

The last of the twelve bishops brought by Bellarmine, is Gregory the First; out of whom four things are alleged. The first is¹, that he required the Africans to permit appeals to Rome from the council of Numidia, and blamed the bishops of Africa, for that after letters written unto them they had degraded Honoratus the archdeacon. The second², that he sent a pall to the bishop of Corinth. The third³, that he saith, Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, acknowledged the Church of Constantinople to be subject to the see apostolic. The fourth⁴, that the bishop of Constantinople professeth his subjection to the see apostolic. To these objections we answer, first⁵, that it is contrary to the resolution of the ancient councils of Carthage and Milevis, that the bishop of Rome should admit appeals of inferior clergymen out of Africa; and that therefore by some positive constitution or later agreement, Gregory might be permitted to hear the complaints of an archdeacon appealing unto him out of Africa, yet from the beginning it was not so, though some parts of Africa were ever within the compass of the patriarchship of Rome. Secondly, that he sent the pall to the bishop of Corinth,

¹ "Ex concilio Numidiæ, si qui desiderarint ad apostolicam sedem venire, permittite; et quilibet eorum viæ contradicere voluerit, obviare."—Greg. Lib. i. Epist. lxii. [Al. lxxiv. Tom. ii. col. 559.]

² "Postquam ad beatitudinem vestram et decessoris mei et mea in causa Honorati archidiaconi, scripta directa sunt, tunc contempta utriusque sententia præfatus Honoratus proprio gradu privatus est. Quod si quilibet ex quatuor patriarchis fecisset, sine gravissimo scandalo tanta contumacia transire nullo modo potuisset."—Id. Lib. ii. Epist. xxxvii. [Al. lii. col. 618.]

³ "Pallium Joanni fratri nostro Corinthiorum episcopo nos transmississe cognoscite, cui nos magnopere decet obedire."—Id. Lib. iv. Epist. lvi. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. lviii. col. 790.]

⁴ "De Constantinopolitana ecclesia quod dicunt, quis eam dubitet sedi apostolicæ esse subjectam; quod et piissimus dominus imperator et frater noster ejusdem civitatis episcopus assidue profitetur."—Id. Lib. vii. Epist. lxiv. [Al. Lib. ix. Epist. xii. col. 941.]

"Quod se dicit sedi apostolicæ subjici; si qua culpa in episcopis invenitur, nescio quis ei episcopus subjectus non sit. Cum vero culpa non exigit, omnes secundum rationem æquales sunt."—Id. Lib. vii. Epist. lxv. [Al. Lib. ix. Epist. lix. col. 976.]

⁵ Vide infra, chap. 39. Of Appeals to Rome.

because he was within his patriarchship; all patriarchs being to confirm their metropolitans by imposition of hands, or by sending the pall. Thirdly, that there was no such Eusebius bishop of Constantinople in Gregory's time as is mentioned in the epistle alleged; and that they that were, as John and Cyriacus, strove and contended with Gregory to be above him, and to have the first place in the Church, and that not without the help and furtherance of the emperor: so that it may be doubted whether Gregory wrote this or not, it being so contrary to that we know to have been attempted and sought by the bishops of Constantinople that lived in his time. But granting that Gregory did so write, and that Eusebius, a bishop of Constantinople, did acknowledge his Church to be subject to the see of Rome, yet he meant nothing else thereby but that it was an inferior see, and so subject in such sort as I have declared the inferior sees to be subject to the superior; which subjection will no way prove the supremacy that the popes now claim. Fourthly, that Gregory doth not say that the bishop of Constantinople acknowledged himself subject to the bishop of Rome: for it was not *primas Byzanzenus*, the primate of Byzantium, that Gregory reporteth to have confess himself subject to the bishop of Rome, and whose cause the emperor commanded Gregory to hear, but *primas Byzanzenus*¹, that is, the primate of the Byzazene province of Africa. So that this confession of the primate mentioned by Gregory, brought to prove that the bishop of Rome had a commanding power over the bishop of Constantinople, is merely mistaken by Bellarmine, as it was before him by Gratian. But some man will say, Howsoever there be a mistaking of this allegation, yet it is strong and forcible to prove the thing intended; for Gregory saith expressly, that howsoever all bishops in respect of humility be equal, yet there is no bishop but if he be found faulty is subject to the see of Rome. That this saying of Gregory may be found true, certain limitations must be added unto it. For the bishop of Rome might not immediately punish every bishop that he found to offend, nor upon appeal take notice of the faults and misdemeanours of all bishops; but the council of

¹ In Epist. lxiv. agitur de primate Byzanceno provinciae Africae.—Annot. in Gratian. Decret. Part. I. Dist. xxii. cap. 5. [col. 125, Par. 1585.]

Chalcedon¹ ordereth, that if any inferior clergyman have aught against another inferior clerk, the matter shall be heard and determined by the bishop, or such as with the liking of the bishop shall by the parties be chosen arbitrators; and if he go against their determination, he shall be punished. If a clerk have aught against his own or another bishop, it shall be inquired of in the audience of the synod of the province; if either clerk or bishop have aught against the metropolitan of the province, he shall go to the primate of the diocese, or to the throne and see of the regal city of Constantinople. This canon of the great council of Chalcedon was confirmed by the decree of Justinian the emperor. "If any man," saith the emperor², "accuse a bishop, for whatsoever cause, let the cause be judged by the metropolitan; and if any man gainsay the metropolitan, let the matter be referred to the archbishop, and patriarch of that diocese, and let him end it according to the canons and laws." So that we see the bishops of Rome might not intermeddle in judging inferior bishops, subject to other patriarchs, neither immediately, nor upon complaint and appeal, whatsoever their faults be: but they have other supreme judges, who have power finally to determine such matters, and from whom there lieth no appeal. This canon of the council of Chalcedon, and the emperor's decree confirming the same, Gregory³ allegeth and alloweth,

¹ "Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πράγμα ἔχοι, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπίσκοπον καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια κατατρεχέτω· ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὴν ὑπόθεσιν γυμναζέτω παρὰ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἥγουν γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου παρ' οἷς ἂν τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν μέρη βούλεται, τὰ τῆς δίκης συγκροτεῖσθω. Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσαι, κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις. Εἰ δέ καὶ κληρικὸς ἔχοι πράγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω. Εἰ δέ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίῃ, καταλαβανέτω ἢ τὸν ἑξάρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω."—Concil. Chalced. can. ix. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1685.]

² "Si a clero aut alio quocunque aditio contra episcopum fiat propter quamlibet causam, apud sanctissimum ejus metropolitam secundum canones et leges huic præbeat finem. Si vero contra metropolitam talis aditio fiat ab episcopo, aut clero, aut alia quacunque persona, diocesens illius beatissimus patriarcha simili modo causam judicet."—Justinian. Novell. cxxiii. cap. 22. [Ad calc. Gothofred. Corp. Jur. Civil. p. 173, Amst. 1663.]

³ "Contra hæc si dictum fuerit quia nec metropolitam habuit nec

only adding, that if there be no metropolitan or patriarch, such things as otherwise should be finally determined and ended by them are to be brought to the bishop of Rome: wherefore it seemeth that Gregory speaketh of the bishops within his own patriarchship, whom sometimes he calleth his own bishops, when he saith there is no bishop but if he be found faulty is subject to the see of Rome. Of these he speaketh when he saith¹, "I impute it to my sins that my own bishops should thus despise me." And again: "If the causes of bishops committed to me be thus dealt with, alas what shall I do?" And in this sense he willeth John of Palermo², to whom he sendeth a pall, not to suffer the reverence of the apostolic see to be troubled by any man's presumption: for that the state of the members is then entire and safe, when the canons are kept, and no injury hurteth the head of the faith: not naming the Church of Rome the head of the faith, for that the bishop of Rome hath an infallible judgment, and absolute command in matters of faith, upon which all the world must depend (as some ignorantly construe him), but because it was the head, that is, the beginning and wellspring, whence the doctrine of faith, the knowledge of God, and all Christian institution flowed to sundry other Churches; which therefore are in a sort to depend on it, to have recourse to it, and to hold conformity with it. "No other," saith Innocentius³, "established and founded the

patriarcham, dicendum est quia a sede apostolica, quæ omnium ecclesiarum caput est, causa hæc audienda ac dirimenda fuerat."—Greg. Lib. xi. Epist. liv. [Al. Lib. xiii. Epist. xlv. Tom. ii. col. 1254.]

¹ "Ut episcopi mei me despiciant, et contra me refugium ad seculares judices habeant, omnipotenti Deo gratias ago, peccatis meis deputo."—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxiv. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xxi. Tom. ii. col. 752.] Et in Epist. xxxvi. hortatur Eulogium episc. Alexandr. et Anastasium Antiochenum ut omnes episcopos eorum curæ subjectos ab iniquitate elationis episc. Constantinopolitani prohibeant.—[Al. Lib. v. Epist. xliii. col. 773.]

² "Illud admonemus ut apostolicæ sedis reverentia nullius præsumptione turbetur. Tunc enim status membrorum integer manet, si caput fidei nulla pulset injuria, et canonum maneat incolumis atque intemerata semper auctoritas."—Lib. xi. Epist. xlii. [Leg. xxiv. Al. Lib. xiii. Epist. xxxvi. col. 1244.]

³ "Præsertim cum sit manifestum in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam, insulasque interjacentes, nullum instituisse ecclesias, nisi eos quos venerabilis apostolus Petrus aut ejus

Churches of Italy, France, Germany, Spain, Africk, and the isles that lie between, but Peter and his successors: and therefore the bishops of these Churches must keep such observations as the Roman Church (from which they took their beginning) received from the apostles, *ne caput institutionum omittere videantur*, that is, 'lest they seem to forsake the head and wellspring of all the institutions and ordinances they have.' This is the reason why the Churches of these parts have been so subject to the Church of Rome, namely, for that from thence they received the light of Christian knowledge; but to all Churches it is not an head in this sort, seeing they received the faith not from Rome, but from some other apostolical Church, as Antioch, or Alexandria."

CHAPTER XXXV.

OF THE PRETENDED PROOFS OF THE POPE'S SUPREMACY PRODUCED AND BROUGHT OUT OF THE WRITINGS OF THE GREEK FATHERS.

HAVING examined the proofs they bring for confirmation of the pope's supremacy out of councils, and the writings of ancient bishops of Rome, let us come to the testimonies of the fathers Greek and Latin.

The first that they produce amongst Greek fathers is Ignatius¹, who writeth to the holy Church which hath the precedence in the region of the Romans, or sitteth before other in the region of the Romans; from which words nothing can be inferred that we ever doubted of. For we most willingly confess the Roman Church to have been in order

successores constituerint sacerdotes. Aut legant, si in his provinciis alius apostolorum invenitur aut legitur docuisse. Quod si non legunt, quia nusquam invenitur, oportet eos hoc sequi quod ecclesia Romana custodit, a qua eos principium accepisse non dubium est; ne dum peregrinis assertionibus student, caput institutionum videantur omittere."—Innocent. Epist. ad Decentium Eugubinum. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 4.]

¹ "Ἡ τις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων."—Ignat. ad Romanos. [Coteler. Patr. Apost. Tom. II. p. 25, Amst. 1724.]

and honour the first and chiefest of all Churches; and he saith nothing out of which any other thing may be concluded.

The next is Irenæus¹, who being to show against heretics, that the tradition of the Church is against them, and for him, and thinking it very tedious to run through the successions of all Churches, saith, he will content himself with that which is the greatest, ancientest, best known to all, and founded by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome; for that the whole Church, that is, the company of all faithful ones, that are everywhere, in which the tradition hath been ever preserved, must of necessity agree in her tradition with this, *propter potentiolem principalitatem*, that is: "For that it is the principal of all other." This testimony of Irenæus no way proveth the thing is question. For here is nothing of the dependence of all other Churches on the Church of Rome, in their faith and profession, nor that all Churches have kept the faith in that Church, that is, in cleaving to it, as to their head and mother, as Bellarmine untruly fancieth: but all that is here said, is nothing else, but that undoubtedly the same faith was given and delivered to all other Churches that was delivered by blessed Peter and Paul to the Church of Rome, the chiefest of all.

The two next Greek fathers that are produced to testify for the supremacy are Epiphanius², and Athanasius³, who

¹ "Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quæ habet ab apostolis traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo vel per sui placentiam malam vel vanam gloriam vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam præterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiolem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, ab his qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio."—Iren. advers. Hæres. Lib. III. cap. 3. [p. 201, Oxon. 1702.]

² "Οὐρσάκιος καὶ Οὐάλης, μετὰ λιβέλλων προσελθόντες τῷ μακαρίτῃ Ἰουλίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης ὑπεραπολογούμενοι τοῦ αὐτῶν σφάλματος, κ.τ.λ."—Epiphan. Hæres. LXVIII. [Tom. I. p. 725.]

³ "Οὐκέτι γὰρ κρίσεως δεῖται τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς· κέκριται γὰρ οὐχ ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δεύτερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις. Πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ χώρα συναγομένη ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων ἐγγὺς ἑκατόν. Δεύτερον δὲ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ, γράψαντος

report, that Ursacius and Valens, sworn enemies of Athanasius, repenting them of their former errors, came to Julius bishop of Rome, to give an account and to seek favour and reconciliation. Surely, the producing of such testimonies as these are, is nothing else but mere trifling; and they that bring them know right well, that they no way prove the thing questioned. The circumstances of this narration touching Ursacius and Valens are these. The cause of Athanasius, as himself testifieth¹, was first heard in his own province, by an hundred bishops, and he there acquitted: secondly at Rome, by more than fifty bishops, at the desire of Eusebius his adversary: and lastly, at Sardica, by three hundred bishops, where he was likewise acquitted. To the decrees of this synod, Ursacius and Valens, his enemies, making show of repentance, subscribed, confessing they had played the sycophants: neither rested they there, but they wrote to Julius bishop of Rome, to testify their repentance, and to desire reconciliation, and likewise to Athanasius himself. It were strange if any man could prove the absolute supreme power and commanding authority of the bishop of Rome over all the world by this testimony, wherein nothing is found of submission to Julius, or of seeking his favour and communion more than the favour and communion of Athanasius, and all other catholic bishops adhering to him. The Epistle of Athanasius to Felix bishop of Rome is a mere counterfeit, as that worthy and renowned Jewel² hath proved at large by unanswerable demonstrations; and therefore it needeth no answer. The allegation of the accusation of Dionysius of Alexandria to Dionysius of Rome, joined with it by Bellarmine, is of the very same stamp; and yet if it were not, proveth nothing against us. For there is no question, but that in matter of

Εὐσεβίου, καὶ κληθέντων αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν, καὶ συναχθέντων ἐπισκόπων κακεῖ πλέον πεντήκοντα. Καὶ τρίτον ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ τῇ ἐν Σαρδικῇ συναχθείσῃ κατὰ πρόσταξιν τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων βασιλέων Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Κώνσταντος· ἐν ᾗ καὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμῶν γενόμενοι καθηρέθησαν ὡς συκοφάνται, τοῖς τε κριθείσιν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν συνεψηφίσαντο μὲν ἐπίσκοποι πλείους τριακοσίων. . . . Ἐπεμαρτύρησαν δὲ τούτοις Οὐρσάκιος καὶ Οὐάλης, οἱ πρότερον μὲν διαβάλλοντες, ὕστερον δὲ μεταγνόντες. . . . Οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι νικηθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἠξίωσαν, καὶ γράψαντες ἐπιδεδώκασιν Ἰουλίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης.”—Athanas. Apol. ii. [Contr. Arian. Tom. i. p. 123, Par. 1698.]

¹ Apol. Prædict.

² Defence of the Challenge, Artic. of the Supremacy. [Reply to Harding, Vol. ii. p. 156, sqq. Oxon. 1848.]

faith, men may accuse any erring bishop to the bishop of Rome and his western bishops, and that they may judge and condemn such a one, though the pope be not supreme head of the Church.

The fifth Greek father that they allege¹ is Basil², who, as they say, in an epistle to Athanasius, attributeth to the bishop of Rome authority to visit the Churches of the East, to make decrees, and to reverse the decrees of general councils, such as that of Ariminum was. Truly, to say no more, the alleging of this testimony sheweth they have very little conscience that allege it. For these are the circumstances of Basil's Epistle, whereof let the reader judge. Basil writing to Athanasius (whom he highly commendeth, for that, whereas other think it well if they take care of their own particular Churches, his care was no less for the whole Church, than for that which was specially committed to him), adviseth him, that the only way to settle things put out of order in the eastern Churches by the Arians, were the procuring of the consent of the western bishops, if it were possible, to intreat them to interpose themselves; for that undoubtedly the rulers would greatly regard and much reverence the credit of their multitude, and people everywhere would follow them without gainsaying. But seeing this, which was rather to be desired, would not in likelihood easily be obtained, he wisheth that the bishop of Rome might be induced to send some of good discretion and moderation, who by gentle admonitions might pacify the minds of men, and might have all things in readiness that

¹ "Basilus tribuit Romano episcopo auctoritatem visitandi ecclesias Orientis, et ex auctoritate decreta faciendi ac rescindendi concilia generalia quale erat Ariminense."—Bellarm. [Lib. II. cap. 15, p. 319.]

² "Ἐφάνη δὲ ἡμῖν ἀκόλουθον ἐπιστεῖλαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης, ἐπισκέψασθαι τὰ ἐνταῦθα, καὶ δοῦναι γνώμην, ἵν' ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ κοινοῦ καὶ συνοδικοῦ δόγματος ἀποσταλῆναί τινας δύσκολον τῶν ἐκείθεν, αὐτὸν αὐθεντῆσαι περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἐκλεξάμενον ἄνδρας ἱκανοὺς μὲν ὁδοιπορίας πόνους ὑπενεγκεῖν, ἱκανοὺς δὲ πραότητι καὶ εὐτονίᾳ ἥθους τοὺς ἐνδιαστρόφους τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν νοουθετῆσαι· ἐπιτηδείως δὲ καὶ οἰκονομικῶς κεχρημένους τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ πάντα ἔχοντας μεθ' ἑαυτῶν τὰ μετὰ Ἀριμίνον πεπραγμένα, ἐπὶ λύσει τῶν κατ' ἀνάγκην ἐκεῖ γενομένων."—Basil. Epist. lii. [Al. lxix. Tom. III. p. 162. Par. 1730.]

"Πάλαι οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ τὴν ἐννυάρχουσάν μοι μετρίως τῶν πραγμάτων κατάληψιν, μίαν ἐπιγνοὺς ὁδὸν βοηθείας ταῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐκκλησίαις τὴν παρὰ τῶν δυτικῶν ἐπισκόπων σύμπνοιαν."—Id. Epist. xxviii. [Leg. xlviii. Al. lxvi. Tom. III. p. 159.]

report, that Ursacius and Valens, sworn enemies of Athanasius, repenting them of their former errors, came to Julius bishop of Rome, to give an account and to seek favour and reconciliation. Surely, the producing of such testimonies as these are, is nothing else but mere trifling; and they that bring them know right well, that they no way prove the thing questioned. The circumstances of this narration touching Ursacius and Valens are these. The cause of Athanasius, as himself testifieth¹, was first heard in his own province, by an hundred bishops, and he there acquitted: secondly at Rome, by more than fifty bishops, at the desire of Eusebius his adversary: and lastly, at Sardica, by three hundred bishops, where he was likewise acquitted. To the decrees of this synod, Ursacius and Valens, his enemies, making show of repentance, subscribed, confessing they had played the sycophants: neither rested they there, but they wrote to Julius bishop of Rome, to testify their repentance, and to desire reconciliation, and likewise to Athanasius himself. It were strange if any man could prove the absolute supreme power and commanding authority of the bishop of Rome over all the world by this testimony, wherein nothing is found of submission to Julius, or of seeking his favour and communion more than the favour and communion of Athanasius, and all other catholic bishops adhering to him. The Epistle of Athanasius to Felix bishop of Rome is a mere counterfeit, as that worthy and renowned Jewel² hath proved at large by unanswerable demonstrations; and therefore it needeth no answer. The allegation of the accusation of Dionysius of Alexandria to Dionysius of Rome, joined with it by Bellarmine, is of the very same stamp; and yet if it were not, proveth nothing against us. For there is no question, but that in matter of

Εὐσεβίου, καὶ κληθέντων αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν, καὶ συναχθέντων ἐπισκόπων καὶ κεῖ πλέον πεντήκοντα. Καὶ τρίτον ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ τῇ ἐν Σαρδικῇ συναχθείσῃ κατὰ πρόσταξιν τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων βασιλέων Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Κωνσταντος· ἐν ᾗ καὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμῶν γερόμενοι καθηρέθησαν ὡς συκοφάνται, τοῖς τε κριθεῖσιν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν συνεψηφίσαντο μὲν ἐπίσκοποι πλείους τριακοσίων. . . . Ἐπεμαρτύρησαν δὲ τούτοις Οὐρσάκιος καὶ Οὐάλης, οἱ πρότερον μὲν διαβάλλοντες, ὕστερον δὲ μεταγνόντες. . . . Οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι νικηθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἡξίωσαν, καὶ γράψαντες ἐπιδεδώκασιν Ἰουλίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης."—Athanas. Apol. II. [Contr. Arian. Tom. I. p. 123, Par. 1698.]

¹ Apol. Prædict.

² Defence of the Challenge, Artic. of the Supremacy. [Reply to Harding, Vol. II. p. 156, sqq. Oxon. 1848.]

faith, men may accuse any erring bishop to the bishop of Rome and his western bishops, and that they may judge and condemn such a one, though the pope be not supreme head of the Church.

The fifth Greek father that they allege¹ is Basil², who, as they say, in an epistle to Athanasius, attributeth to the bishop of Rome authority to visit the Churches of the East, to make decrees, and to reverse the decrees of general councils, such as that of Ariminum was. Truly, to say no more, the alleging of this testimony sheweth they have very little conscience that allege it. For these are the circumstances of Basil's Epistle, whereof let the reader judge. Basil writing to Athanasius (whom he highly commendeth, for that, whereas other think it well if they take care of their own particular Churches, his care was no less for the whole Church, than for that which was specially committed to him), adviseth him, that the only way to settle things put out of order in the eastern Churches by the Arians, were the procuring of the consent of the western bishops, if it were possible, to intreat them to interpose themselves; for that undoubtedly the rulers would greatly regard and much reverence the credit of their multitude, and people everywhere would follow them without gainsaying. But seeing this, which was rather to be desired, would not in likelihood easily be obtained, he wisheth that the bishop of Rome might be induced to send some of good discretion and moderation, who by gentle admonitions might pacify the minds of men, and might have all things in readiness that

¹ "Basilus tribuit Romano episcopo auctoritatem visitandi ecclesias Orientis, et ex auctoritate decreta faciendi ac rescindendi concilia generalia quale erat Ariminense."—Bellarm. [Lib. II. cap. 15, p. 319.]

² "Ἐφάνη δὲ ἡμῖν ἀκόλουθον ἐπιστεῖλαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης, ἐπισκέψασθαι τὰ ἐνταῦθα, καὶ δοῦναι γνώμην, ἵν' ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ κοινοῦ καὶ συνοδικοῦ δόγματος ἀποσταλῆναί τινας δύσκολον τῶν ἐκεῖθεν, αὐτὸν αὐθεντῆσαι περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἐκλεξάμενον ἄνδρας ἱκανοὺς μὲν ὁδοιπορίας πόνους ὑπενεγκεῖν, ἱκανοὺς δὲ πραότητι καὶ εὐτονίᾳ ἡθοὺς τοὺς ἐνδιαστρόφους τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν νοουθετῆσαι· ἐπιτηδεῖως δὲ καὶ οἰκονομικῶς κεχρημένους τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ πάντα ἔχοντας μεθ' ἑαυτῶν τὰ μετὰ Ἀριμίνον πεπραγμένα, ἐπὶ λύσει τῶν κατ' ἀνάγκην ἐκεῖ γενομένων."—Basil. Epist. lii. [Al. lxi. Tom. III. p. 162. Par. 1730.]

"Πάλαι οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ τὴν ἐνυπάρχουσάν μοι μετρίως τῶν πραγμάτων κατάληψιν, μίαν ἐπιγνοὺς ὁδὸν βοηθείας ταῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐκκλησίαις τὴν παρὰ τῶν δυτικῶν ἐπισκόπων σύμπνοιαν."—Id. Epist. xxviii. [Leg. xlviii. Al. lxi. Tom. III. p. 159.]

concerned the Arimine council, necessary for the dissolving and showing the invalidity of the acts of that council. I doubt not but the reader, upon the bare view of these circumstances, will easily perceive that this epistle of Basil maketh very much against their opinion that allege it: for he preferreth, and rather wisheth a council, than the pope's own interposing of himself, if there had been any hope of a council. Besides, these whom the pope was to send, were not to proceed judicially, and by way of authority, but by intreaty and gentle admonitions to pacify the minds of men: and therefore here is nothing of visiting the Churches of the East, or voiding the acts of the council of Ariminum by way of sentence and formal proceeding, as Bellarmine untruly reporteth; but only a reaching forth of the hand of help to the distressed parts of the Church, by them that were in better state, and a manifesting or declaring of the invalidity of that council, the unlawful proceedings of it, and the reasons why it neither was nor ever ought to be admitted.

The sixth Greek father brought to be a witness of the pope's supremacy is Gregory Nazianzen¹, who saith, that the Roman Church did ever hold the right profession, as it becometh the city which is over all the world. This testimony is no less abused than the former, as it will easily appear to him that will take the pains to view the place alleged. "Nature," saith Nazianzen, "doth not afford two suns; yet are there two Romes, the lights of the whole world; the old and the new seat of the empire. The one of these lights appeareth at the rising, and the other at the setting of the sun, and both jointly send forth a most excellent glittering brightness. The faith of the one was a long time, and now is right, knitting, and joining the West to the saving word of

¹ Δύω μὲν οὐ δέδωκεν ἡλίου φύσις·
 Δισσὰς δὲ Ῥώμας, τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης
 Λαμπτήρας, ἀρχαῖόν τε καὶ νέον κράτος.
 Τόσον διαφερόντας ἀλλήλων, ὅσον
 Τὴν μὲν προλάμπειν ἡλίου, τὴν δ' ἐσπέρας·
 Κάλλει δὲ κάλλος ἀντανίσχειν συζύγως.
 Τούτων δὲ πίστις, ἥ μὲν ἦν ἐκ πλείονος,
 Καὶ νῦν ἐτ' ἔστιν εὐδρομος, τὴν ἐσπέραν
 Πᾶσαν δέουσα τῷ σωτηρίῳ λόγῳ
 Καθὼς δίκαιον τὴν προέδρον τῶν ὅλων.

Greg. Naz. Carm. de Vita sua. [Carm. xi. l. 562. Tom. i. p. 705.]

life, as it is fit the mistress and lady of the world should be." In which words it is evident that he speaketh of the greatness of the city of Rome, in respect of her civil and temporal sovereignty, and not in respect of the spiritual power of the Church; and therefore it is strange that Bellarmine should deny the same. For though in the time of Nazianzen the emperor made his abode for the most part at Constantinople, and not at Rome, yet he calleth Rome the mistress of the world, in respect of the civil state thereof, as appeareth in that he speaketh of two famous cities, two lights of the world; and nameth the one the old seat, and the other the new seat of the empire.

The seventh Greek father is Chrysostom, who (if we may believe Bellarmine) being deposed by Theophilus bishop of Alexandria, and put from the bishopric of Constantinople in a council of bishops¹, writeth to the bishop of Rome by his authority to void the sentence of Theophilus, and to punish him: whence it will follow, that Chrysostom acknowledged the Roman bishop to be supreme judge of the Greek or eastern bishops, and consequently of all the world. For the better manifesting of the bad dealing of the cardinal in alleging this testimony, I will briefly set down all the most material and principal circumstances of the narration of the most unjust deposition of Chrysostom, that worthy and renowned bishop of Constantinople. Thus therefore the case stood². There arose a question in the Churches of Egypt, whether God were *ἀνθρωπόμορφος*; that is, had the shape of a man. Some of the simpler sort of monks thought that God hath a bodily form or shape; others thought otherwise, and condemned such as so thought, as blasphemous. Theo-

¹ "Deposuerat Chrysostomum ab episcopatu Constantinopolitano Theophilus episcopus Alexandrinus in concilio multorum episcoporum: Chrysostomus ad Romanum pontificem scribit ut ipse sua auctoritate decernat irritam esse sententiam Theophili, et Theophilum ipsum puniat. Agnoscit ergo Chrysostomus Innocentiam papam ut summum judicem etiam Græcorum."—Bellarm. ubi supra. Vide Epist. Chrysost. ad Innocent. [Tom. III. p. 519.]

² Sozomen. H.E. VIII. 11 et sq. Socrat. H.E. VI. 8, sqq. Pallad. et Greg. Alex. in Vita Chrysostomi. [Inter Opp. Chrysost. Tom. XIII. init.] Niceph. H.E. XIII. [10, sqq. Baron. Ann. 403, num. 2. [Tom. VI. p. 411. Luc. 1740.] et Bin. Concil. I. p. 580. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 30.]

philus, bishop of Alexandria, was of opinion, that God is not *ἀνθρωπόμορφος*, that is, that God hath no bodily shape or form: which the monks that thought otherwise greatly disliking, came to Alexandria with a full purpose to kill and destroy him, as a wicked and godless person. But he perceiving their affection, presented himself speedily unto them, saying, “I have seen you, and looked upon you, as upon the face of God;” and thereby pacified them for the present, supposing he had been of their opinion, and had thought God to have a face and countenance like man. But afterwards, having upon some dislike excommunicated Isidorus, a presbyter of his Church, Isidorus goeth to the monks, and thereupon Ammonius with certain other come to Theophilus, desiring him to receive such to the communion as he had excommunicated, which he promised to do, but performed not. Hereupon farther quarrels grew, and Theophilus perceiving that these monks were in opinion contrary to the Anthropomorphites, joined himself with the Anthropomorphites, and intended some ill to the other; whereupon Ammonius, Dioscorus, and Isidore, came to Constantinople, and desired that the emperor and Chrysostom might hear the matter between them. Chrysostom used them kindly, and suffered them to be present at the common prayers, but admitted them not to the communion: he wrote to Theophilus, to restore them to the communion as being right believers, and desired him, if he thought fit to have their cause heard and examined at Constantinople, to send some to follow the business for him: whereunto Theophilus returned no answer; which moved the complainants to sue to the empress that a council might be called, which she promised to procure; but in the mean while there being a rumour raised, that Chrysostom had received Dioscorus and the rest to the communion, and that he sought to stead them what he could, Theophilus enraged against him began to devise how he might put him from his bishopric. To this purpose he writeth to sundry bishops, reprehending the books of Origen, wherein the error of the Anthropomorphites was condemned. Amongst other, he drew into his faction by this means Epiphanius, a man erring in that point, but otherwise of great authority for his good life and learning. Epiphanius calleth a synod of the bishops of Cyprus, condemneth the books of Origen, forbiddeth the reading of them, and per-

suadeth other, and amongst them the bishop of Constantinople, to do the like. Theophilus likewise followed his example, and with his bishops passed the like decree; but Chrysostom neglected the matter, which offended Epiphanius and Theophilus not a little. Hereupon many of the great ones in Constantinople, and of the clergy also hating Chrysostom, perceiving that Theophilus was bent against him, urged him to go forward, and procured a great synod to be called at Constantinople; which opportunity he neglected not, commanding the bishops of Egypt to go thither, and writing to Epiphanius and the rest of the eastern bishops to come thither. Epiphanius accordingly came thither, showed himself averse from Chrysostom, and would neither come into the same house, nor pray with him, though he sought him with great respect. Whereupon after a while, Epiphanius in great dislike departed from Constantinople; at the parting of these bishops, the one of them saying, he hoped the other should never return home; the other, that he should never die a bishop: both which fell out accordingly; for Epiphanius died by the way as he was returning home, and Chrysostom cast out of his bishopric died in banishment. After the departing of Epiphanius, Chrysostom made a sermon in reproof and reprehension of women; which so moved and enraged the empress, that she complained bitterly to her husband, and urged him to cause Theophilus to come quickly and to hold a council, which accordingly he did. Chrysostom was called to come into the synod; but he answered that he refused not judgment, but desired to know his accusers, and what crimes he was charged with, and protested against these judges as partial, appealing to a general council, whereupon he was deposed. Three days after he withdrew himself; which put the people into an uproar, who stirring in very tumultuous manner forced the emperor to bring him back again, and caused him to take his chair again, thirty bishops bringing him to it. Here began a new quarrel, for that being deposed by a synod, he resumed his place without a synod: but the matter was reasonably well quieted, till reprehending those in authority for permitting certain abuses, the empress thinking herself touched, began again to think how she might procure another greater council to be called than before; which Chrysostom understanding, made that sermon that beginneth, *Herodias*

denuo insanire, denuo commoveri, denuo saltare pergit, denuo caput Joannis in disco accipere quærit: that is, "Herodias proceedeth and goeth on to be mad again, to be moved and stirred again, and to dance again: she seeks once again to have the head of John in a platter." It was not long after the preaching of this sermon, before the bishops came together and met in synod, by the procurement of the empress; who omitting all other things, objected unto him the resuming of his place without a synod. He answered, that there were fifty bishops that consented to him, and communicated with him; but they replied, that there were more that condemned him, and that therefore by the canon he ought not to have resumed his place. To whom he answered, that that was a canon of the Arians, made by them when they proceeded against Athanasius, and therefore not to be regarded. But that answer would not serve the turn: wherefore they proceeded to sentence against him, and put him out of his bishopric, and the emperor immediately sent him into banishment. Being in this distress, and thus grievously wronged, he writeth to Innocentius and the western bishops, desiring them to do what they can to repress these vile practices, and to write, that the things done against him be of no force, as indeed they are not; and that he might still hold communion with them, as before he had done. The bishop of Rome upon this his suit called a synod of all the bishops of the West¹, held both Theophilus and Chrysostom in their communion, pronounced the judgment of Theophilus, and his proceedings against Chrysostom, to be void, as being against the canons; and yet told Chrysostom, there was no help, nor no means to relieve him, but in a general council, which by all possible means he will labour to procure: till which time he must be content, and refer all to God, who taketh care of these things. But with how ill success he sought to procure a general council for the restoring of him to his place again, we may find in Sozomen²: who reporteth, that being desirous that Chrysostom might return, he sent with those oriental bishops that came to him to intreat his help and assistance, five bishops and two presbyters to Honorius and Arcadius, to obtain a

¹ Vide Epist. Innocent. ad Chrysost. et Theophil. apud Bin. Concil. Tom. I. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 69.]

² Sozom. H. E. VIII. 18.

council, and to have the time appointed; who were so far from prevailing and obtaining that they sought, that they were sent away with disgrace, as foreign and outlandish disturbers of the state of the empire. These are the principal and most material circumstances of the narration and report of the unjust deposition of Chrysostom, his writing to the bishop of Rome, and the answer he had from him, and the other bishops of the West, which make most strongly against the pretended supremacy of popes. For Innocentius telleth Chrysostom's friends, that it lieth not in him to help him, but in a general council: and though he and the bishops of the West pronounce the proceedings of Theophilus void, as against the canons, and do make them void, as much as by their dissenting they can, yet they confess, that the absolute voiding of them, and the punishing of Theophilus, was not in them, but in a general council. "But," saith Bellarmine¹, "Chrysostom in another epistle giveth Innocentius thanks for his fatherly care and kindness, and intreateth that his enemies may not be excluded from the communion, if by any means they may be reclaimed: therefore it seemeth Chrysostom thought he had an absolute supreme commanding power." What it is in this epistle that argueth that supreme power which Bellarmine dreameth of, I cannot tell. For I know no reason why Chrysostom, now a deposed and distressed bishop, might not use so respective a form of speech to the bishop of the first see, and esteem of him as a father, without acknowledging him to have any absolute supreme power over all. And all the other circumstances and parts of the epistle most clearly make against the papacy. For he saith, Innocentius had done what he could; but that his enemies notwithstanding went still forward in their ill courses; and for the avoiding of greater scandals, distractions, and confusions, desireth him not to reject them from his communion, considering the greatness of the work: for that this was the contention almost of all the world. So that the Churches were brought upon their knees, the people dispersed, the clergy vexed, bishops banished, and the constitutions of the holy fathers violated and broken.

¹ "Agnoscit Chrysostomus Innocentium ut patrem, cum tamen ipse senior Innocentio esset, et episcopus regię urbis. Denique petit ab Innocentio ne inimicos suos excommunicet, tametsi illi hoc mereantur." —Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

The eighth Greek father is Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, out of whom Bellarmine allegeth no new thing, but the very same which he brought out of the council of Ephesus, whereof he was president; and therefore I will make no new answer here to this renewed allegation, but refer the reader to the answer already made¹.

The ninth Greek father is Theodoret, out of whom Bellarmine seeketh to confirm the papacy, for that though he were a bishop of Asia, and had under him eight hundred churches, yet he² acknowledgeth the bishop of Rome to be his supreme judge: and in an epistle written to Renatus, a presbyter of the Church of Rome, saith, that that holy see hath the government and direction of the Churches throughout the world. For answer unto this objection, we must observe, that Theodoret being deposed, banished, and grievously vexed for matters of faith, seeketh to have his cause re-examined and heard again by the bishop of Rome, and the bishops of the West; which thing he obtained, and was by Leo, and the rest of the bishops of the West, judged catholic, received to their communion, and, as much as lay in them, restored to his bishopric again; yet could he not repossess his place, till the council of Chalcedon put him into it; which³, though it were

¹ See chap. xxxiii. [p. 272.]

² “Πρὸς τὸν ἀποστολικὸν ὑμῶν τρέχουμεν θρόνον, ὥστε παρ’ ὑμῶν λαβεῖν τοῖς τῶν ἐκκλησίῳν ἔλκεσι θεραπείαν. Διὰ παντὰ γὰρ ὑμῖν τὸ πρωτεύειν ἀρμόττει.”—Theodoret. Epist. ad Leonem. [Epist. cxiii. Tom. iv. p. 1187, Halæ, 1772.]

“Ἐχει ὁ πανάγιος θρόνος ἐκεῖνος τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησιῳν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν διὰ πολλὰ καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων.”—Id. Epist. ad Renat. [Epist. cxvi. p. 1197.]

³ “Θεοδώρητον μέντοι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Κύρου τῆς πόλεως, ὃν ἤδη ἐκελεύσαμεν τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτοῦ μόνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ σχολάζειν, θεσπίζομεν μὴ πρότερον ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον, ἐὰν μὴ πάσῃ τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ συνελθούσῃ δόξῃ καὶ αὐτὸν παραγένεσθαι τῆς αὐτῆς ἁγίας συνόδου.”—Concil. Chalcedon. Act. i. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 872.]

“Οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἄρχοντες εἶπον· Ἡ πᾶσα λοιπὸν περὶ Θεοδώρητου τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου ἀμφιβολία λέλυται. Καὶ γὰρ Νεστόριον ἐπὶ ἡμῶν ἀναθεμάτισε, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου καὶ ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Λέοντος τῆς πρεσβύτιδος Ῥώμης προσεδέχθη, καὶ τὸν ὅρον τῆς πίστεως τὸν παρὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας θεοσεβείας δοθέντα ἐδέξατο ἀσμένως, καὶ τοῦτο ἔτι μὴν καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τῇ μνημονευθέντὸς ὁσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Λέοντος καθυπέγραψε. . . Πάντες οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβοήσαν, Θεοδώρητος ἄξιός τοῦ θρόνου. Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὸν ὀρθόδοξον. . . Θεοδώρητῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀποδοθῇ.”—Act. viii. [Col. 1524.]

informed by the deputies of Leo, that he had long before received him to his communion, yet admitted him not till he was re-examined; and at the first many of the fathers disliking his answers as imperfect, cried out aloud that he was a Nestorian, and desired that the heretic might be cast out, censuring him as Cyril and other catholic bishops had done before. But when he fully and peremptorily accursed Nestorius with all his adherents, they all with one consenting voice pronounced him worthy of his place, and admitted him to sit in council with them. Whereby it appeareth, that howsoever the western bishops pronounced him catholic, received him to their communion, and, as much as in them lay, restored him to his place; yet of themselves they neither could nor did perfect that work, but were forced to leave it to the general council: all which Leo himself in his epistle to Theodoret acknowledgeth: *Adjutorium nostrum, saith he, in nomine Domini, qui fecit cælum et terram, qui nullum nos in nostris fratribus detrimentum sustinere permisit: sed quæ nostro prius ministerio definierat, universæ fraternitatis irretractabili firmavit assensu, ut vere a se prodiisse ostenderet, quod prius a prima omnium sede formatum, totius Christiani orbis judicium recepisset, ut in hoc quoque capiti membra concordent. Nam, ne aliarum sedium, ad eam quam cæteris omnium Dominus statuit præsidere, consensus, assentatio videretur, inventi prius sunt, qui de judiciis nostris ambigerent*¹: that is, “Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made both heaven and earth, who suffered us not to sustain any loss in our brethren, but confirmed and established, by the irrevocable assent of the whole brotherhood, what things he had before defined by our ministry; that he might clearly show that thing undoubtedly to have proceeded from himself, which being formerly framed by the first see, the judgment of the whole Christian world received: so that herein the head and members conspire together: for lest the consenting of other sees to that which the Lord of all appointed to be the first of all, might seem to be but flattery, there were some found that at first doubted of our judgments, whether they were right or not.” And he addeth, that *multum sacerdotalis officii meritum splendescit, ubi sic summorum servatur auctoritas, ut in nullo inferiorum putetur imminuta libertas*: that

¹ Leo, Epist. in fine Operum Theodoret. [Tom. iv. p. 1193.]

is, "That the excellent worthiness of the priestly office doth then most appear in shining brightness, when the authority of the highest is so retained, that the liberty of the inferior and lesser be thought in nothing to be diminished or impaired." Thereby insinuating, that he and his western bishops did so go before in their resolution touching the case of Theodoret, that they no way diminished, much less took away, the liberty of other inferior sees, but that they might resist and gainsay, till they were satisfied, and made to see the equity of the judgment of the first see: accordingly as we find they did in the council of Chalcedon, rejecting him as an heretic whom the bishop of Rome had received, till upon more full and particular examination they found him to be catholic, and acquitted him in their own judgment. So that here we see there is nothing to prove the pope to be an absolute supreme judge of all, as Bellarmine untruly allegeth. But happily he will say, that Theodoret entreateth Renatus to persuade Leo to use his authority, and to require the bishops that had proceeded against him to come to his synod in the West, seeing the see of Rome hath a direction of all Churches, and that therefore he seemeth to acknowledge an absolute supreme power in the pope. For answer hereunto we say, that the circumstances of this epistle do clearly convince and prove he had no such conceit. For first, he speaketh not of Leo alone, as if of himself he could determine the matter of difference between him and his adversaries, but of him and his western council; secondly, he doth not say, that he and his council alone may determine the matter; but that his see being the first see, he and his bishops may call all other bishops to their council: and this is that direction or government which he saith the first see, or western Church, hath of other Churches; namely, in going before them, and inviting and calling them to public deliberations, not in peremptory and absolute commanding without them and over them.

The tenth witness produced out of the Greek Church is Sozomen, out of whom two things are alleged. The first is, that he saith¹, "Julius bishop of Rome restored Athanasius bishop of Alexandria, and Paulus bishop of Constantinople, to their Churches, from which they were violently and unjustly expelled by certain oriental bishops." The second², that he

¹ Sozom. H. E. III. 7.

² Ibidem.

did this because the care of all pertained to him in respect of the dignity of his see. How the words of Sozomen reporting that Julius restored these bishops to their Churches, are to be understood, we may learn of Julius himself, who in his epistle mentioned by Athanasius in his second *Apology*, having blamed the oriental bishops for proceeding in a matter of so great consequence concerning the faith, and the bishops of the principal Churches of the world, without him and his bishops, and, as he understood, very irregularly; telleth them, that he durst not confirm that they had done, that he communicated still with Athanasius and Paulus, not forejudging anything, but desiring them to come to a synod, where things might be fully debated, and determined; and that, though he alone wrote for them, yet he wrote in the name and with the consent of all the bishops of the West. Upon which his letter¹ they were so far from restoring them to their places, that they took it in ill part that he did write unto them, telling him that when he proceeded against certain Novatians, they intermeddled not, and therefore he should not meddle with their proceedings, seeing the greatness of cities maketh not the power of one bishop greater than the power of another. By which their peremptory rejecting of his motion it appeareth, that he neither did nor could put the expelled bishops into their places again: which thing Sozomen² himself testifieth also, telling us, that they could never recover their places, till the emperor by his mandatory letters prevailed. So that when he saith, Julius restored them, his meaning is, that he restored them as much as lay in him; as likewise it may be said of Cyril, and John of Antioch, that after many and bitter contentions, they were in the end reconciled, and restored each to other their Churches³, from which yet they were never driven indeed, but in the censures of the one of them passed against the other. But Sozomen saith, the care of all Churches pertained to the bishop of Rome, therefore he acknowledgeth that he had an universality of power over all. Surely this consequence will never be made good. For the metropolitan, or he that is bishop of the first see in each province in respect of the dignity of his see, hath the

¹ Sozom. ubi supra.

² Ibid. cap. 9.

³ Socrat. H. E. vii. 23. [Al. 34.] Evagr. H. E. i. 5. Vide Acta Concil. Ephes. [Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1609, sqq.]

care of the whole province, yet can he do nothing but as he is directed by the major part of the bishops. So that the care of all is said to pertain to him, not because he hath power to dispose of all things by himself, but because all public proceedings concerning the whole province must take their beginning from him, and nothing of that nature may be taken in hand without consulting him. In like sort, and in the same sense and meaning, Sozomen saith, that for the dignity of his see the care of all pertained to the bishop of Rome; not as if the absolute disposing of all things did rest in him, but for that he, as prime bishop of the world, was first to be consulted before anything concerning the common faith, and the whole state of the Christian Church, were determined; and for that by the assistance and concurrence of other bishops, he, as first in order and honour amongst them, was to begin and set forward all things of greatest consequence tending to the common good.

Three more witnesses Bellarmine hath yet behind, Acatius the bishop of Patara; and Justinian the emperor, out of whom three things are alleged. The first, that the bishop of Rome beareth about with him the care of all Churches. The second, that the pope is over the Church of the whole world. The third, that the pope is the head of all holy Churches. To the first of these allegations, taken out of Acatius his epistle to Simplicius bishop of Rome, I have answered before; as likewise in what sense the pope may be said to be over the Church of the whole world, to wit, in respect of a primacy of order and honour, but not of power; in which sense also, Justinian the elder, writing to John the Second, saith his see is the head of all Churches. And thus having examined the testimonies of the Greek fathers, we are now to proceed to the authorities of the Latin Church.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

OF THE PRETENDED PROOFS OF THE POPE'S SUPREMACY, TAKEN
OUT OF THE WRITINGS OF THE LATIN FATHERS.

THE first among the Latin fathers that Bellarmine¹ produceth, is Cyprian; who of all other most clearly overthroweth the error of the Romanists touching the papacy, and therefore is very unadvisedly produced by them in the first place, and appointed to marshal and conduct the rest of their witnesses: yet let us hear what he will say. Out of Cyprian four places are alleged. The first is, in his book *de Unitate Ecclesiæ*. The second, in the third epistle of his first book written to Cornelius. The third, in the tenth epistle of his second book to the same Cornelius. The fourth, in the eighth epistle of the first book *ad plebem universam*. Out of the first of these places they will prove that he maketh Peter head of the whole Church. Out of the second, that there is one high priest, and one supreme judge in the Church, whom all men are bound to obey. Out of the third, that Cornelius was head of all catholics. Out of the fourth, that there is one singular chair in the Church, wherein he sitteth that must teach all.

To every of these allegations I will answer in order, and make it most clear and evident, that none of the things imagined by the cardinal can possibly be concluded out of any of the forenamed places. For to begin with the first: whosoever will but read over Cyprian's book Of the Unity of the Church, shall most certainly and undoubtedly find, that he speaketh not in that book of Peter's headship of the universal Church, as the Jesuit fancieth; but of the head, original, and first beginning of pastoral commission. Which that it may the better appear, I will, as briefly as possibly I can, lay down the most principal and material circumstances of the whole discourse of that book, written upon occasion of the schism of the Novatians. The first thing that occurreth in the whole discourse of the book, is the author's observation of the endless malice of Satan, who when he found the idols of the Gentiles, wherein he was wont to be worshipped, to

¹ Bell. De Pont. Lib. ii. cap. 16.

be forsaken, and his seats and temples deserted, almost all professing to believe in Christ, *Hæreses invenit et schismata, quibus subverteret fidem, veritatem corrumperet, scinderet unitatem*¹: that is, “Found out heresies and schisms, by which he might subvert the faith, corrupt the verity, and cut in sunder the unity;” so that *Quos detinere non potest in viæ veteris cæcitate, circumscribit, et decipit novi itineris errore*; that is, “Whom he cannot hold in the blindness and darkness of the old way, those he circumventeth and beguileth, by making them err, go aside, and not hold on the right course of their journey in the new way that leadeth to life.” In the second place he sheweth, that this so falleth out, and that men are so beguiled, and misled into schisms and heresies, because they return not back to the first origin of truth, because they seek not the head, nor keep the doctrine of the heavenly Master: which if a man would consider and think of, he should not need to seek out many arguments, nor fetch any great compass about; but the truth would easily without any great search offer itself unto him. For therefore did Christ, when he was to lay the foundations of the Christian Church, say specially to Peter, “Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church; and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven²:” and again after his resurrection, “Feed my sheep³:” because though rising again from the dead, he gave like power to the apostles, when he said, “As my Father sent me, so send I you: whose sins ye remit, they are remitted: whose sins ye retain, they are retained⁴:” yet he would by speaking specially to one, and by appointing one chair, show what unity should be in the Church. “The rest of the apostles,” saith Cyprian⁵,

¹ [Cyprian. De Unit. Eccles. p. 105, Oxon. 1682.]

² Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

³ John xxi. 15, 16.

⁴ John xx. 21, 23.

⁵ “Hoc erant utique et cæteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate profiscitur, ut ecclesia una monstretur; quam unam ecclesiam etiam in Cantico Canticorum Spiritus Sanctus ex persona Domini designat, et dicit, ‘Una est columba mea, perfecta mea, una est matri suæ, electa generici suæ.’”

“Hanc ecclesiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit; qui ecclesiæ renititur et resistit, in ecclesia se esse confidit? quando et beatus apostolus Paulus hoc idem doceat, et sacramentum unitatis ostendat, dicens, ‘Unum corpus et unus Spiritus, una spes vocationis

“were undoubtedly the same that Peter was, equal in honour and power: but therefore did Christ in the first place give, or at least promise to give, specially and particularly to one, that apostolic commission which he meant also to give to the rest, that he might thereby show, that the Church must be one, and that there must be but one episcopal chair in the world. All the apostles,” saith Cyprian, “are pastors, but the flock of Christ is but one, which they are to feed with unanimous consent. There is but one body of the Church, one Spirit, one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God. This unity all men must endeavour to keep, especially bishops, that they may make it appear that there is but one bishoply commission in the Christian Church, *cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*; that is, ‘whereof every one indifferently and in equal sort hath his part.’” Here is nothing that proveth the universality of the papal power, or that Peter was by Christ made head of the whole Church: but this place most mainly overthroweth that supposed headship. For Cyprian teacheth, that Christ meant to give equal power and authority to all his apostles, and that the reason, why intending no more to one than to the rest, yet he more specially directed his speech to one than to the rest, was only to show that there must be an unity in the Church, which he settled in that beginning with one; from him he proceeded to the rest, not meaning that the rest should receive anything from him, but that from himself immediately they should receive that in the second place, which he had first, and that they should receive the same commission together with him into which he was first put, that they might know him to be the first of their company. In this sense Innocentius saith, *A Petro ipse episcopatus, et tota auctoritas nominis hujus emersit*¹; that is, “The bishoply office, and the whole authority of this name and title, took beginning from Peter:” “whom,” he saith, “all vestrae, unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus.” Quam unitatem firmiter tenere et vindicare debemus, maxime episcopi qui in ecclesia praesidemus, ut episcopatum quoque ipsum unum atque indivisum probemus. Nemo fraternitatem mendacio fallat; nemo fidei veritatem perfida praevaricatione corrumpat. Episcopatus unus est, *cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*.”—[Ibid. p. 108.]

¹ Inter Epistolas Augustini. Epist. xci. [Al. clxxxi. Tom. II. col. 635. f.]

bishops must respect," as *Sui nominis et honoris authorem*; that is, "as the first and original of their name and honour." And Leo in like sort, *Hujus muneris sacramentum ita Dominus ad omnium apostolorum officium voluit pertinere, ut in beatissimo Petro apostolorum omnium summo principaliter collocaret, ut ab ipso, quasi quodam capite, dona sua velut in corpus omne diffunderet*¹; that is, "The Lord's will was, that the mystery of this heavenly gift, commission, and employment, should so pertain to the ministry and office of all the apostles, that yet he would first and principally place it in most blessed Peter, the greatest of all the apostles, that so beginning with him as the head and first, he might proceed from him to pour forth his gifts into all the body." "But," saith Bellarmine², "Cyprian speaketh of another head of the Church besides Christ, and maketh the Church that so enlargeth itself, and hath so many parts, yet to be one in this root and head: as the beams are many, but the light is one; as the boughs are many, but the tree is one; the rivers are many, but the fountain is one." It is strange that a man of his learning and judgment should so misconceive things as he seemeth to do. For it is most evident to any one that will but take the pains to peruse the place, that Cyprian speaketh not of a distinct head of the Church different from Christ, and appointed by him to govern the Church; but of the original, first beginning, and head of the commission the pastors of the Church have: which commission Christ so gave to all the apostles, that yet first he gave it, or at least, first promised to give it to one, and directed his speech specially to him, to show that none can be pastors of the Church but such as without intrusion are consented on by them, that having this power in unity amongst themselves, may communicate it to others. Neither doth he say, as the Jesuit fancieth³, that the many parts of the Church are one in sub-

¹ Leo, Epist. lxxxix. [Al. Epist. x. Tom. i. col. 633, Ven. 1753.]

² "Proponit . . . caput ecclesiæ, et quidem a Christo diversum. . . . Quare paulo post subjungit, ac docet ecclesiam esse unam in radice et capite, licet propagatione multiplicetur, et ponit tria exempla, lucis, fontis, et arboris. Quæ omnia sunt unum in radice, et propagatione multiplicantur. Habemus ergo ex hoc loco Petrum esse caput totius ecclesiæ."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. ii. cap. 16. [Tom. i. p. 320.]

³ "Ecclesia quoque una est quæ in multitudinem latius incremento

jection to one head distinct from Christ, as the beams of the sun are one in the same light; but in the unity of the same main body. "For even as," saith Cyprian, "the beams of the sun are one in the same light, and the boughs of the tree are one in the same tree; so all Churches must derive themselves from the first Church, and all pastors their commission from the first commission, which Christ gave to all his apostles; yet so, that he put one first into it, and directed his speeches specially unto one, thereby to settle them in an orderly unity amongst themselves." This is undoubtedly the meaning of Cyprian; for it can no way stand, either with truth, with the opinion of Cyprian, or with the opinion of our adversaries themselves, that the rest of the apostles received their ministerial power from Peter, and were subject to him as to an head, and absolute commander over them, seeing he saith expressly, "that they were the same that Peter was, and equal to him, both in honour and power;" and besides, both in this book, and in many other places, he is wont to derive the original of schisms and heresies from the intrusion of men into places already full, or at least into void places, without due admittance and allowance of them that in a kind of coherent concord rule and govern the Church; and never from the resistance against one supreme commander set over all. So in his epistle to Antonianus¹, he proveth Cornelius bishop of

fœcunditatis extenditur: quo modo solis multi radii sed lumen unum; et rami arboris multi sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum; et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copię largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine. Avelle radium solis a corpore, divisionem lucis unitas non capit; ab arbore frange ramum, fractus germinare non poterit; a fonte præcide rivum, præcisus arescet. Sic ecclesia Domini luce perfusa per orbem totum radios suos porrigit, unum tamen lumen est, quod ubique diffunditur, nec unitas corporis separatur: ramos suos in universam terram copia ubertatis extendit, profluentes largiter rivos latius expandit: unum tamen caput est, et origo una, et una mater, fœcunditatis successibus copiosa."—[Ibid. p. 108.]

¹ "Factus est Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio de clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis quæ tunc affuit suffragio, et de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio; cum nemo ante se factus esset cum Fabiani locus, id est, cum locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret."—Id. Epist. lii. [Al. lv. p. 104.]

"Quod autem hoc idem Romano episcopo conveniat declarat idem

Rome to be a true and lawful bishop, because having the testimony of the clergy, and voices of the people, the place of Fabianus being void, he was ordained to succeed him by many bishops then at Rome, who sent their letters abroad, making honourable report of his due and right coming to the place, and the whole number of bishops throughout the world with great unanimity consented: and by the want of these things proveth his factious opposites to be schismatics.

In the second allegation the cardinal bewrayeth very gross ignorance: for it was not a difference between Cornelius and the Novatians, refusing to acknowledge him to be bishop, that gave occasion of writing that epistle¹, as he untruly saith; but the calumniation of Felicissimus and Fortunatus against Cyprian himself; which factious companions being put from the communion by Cyprian, and many of his colleagues, flying to Rome, were there rejected, and thereupon fell to threatening. These threatenings Cyprian despiseth, pronounceth them to be murderers, sheweth that they shall not escape the judgment of God, and that nothing is to be remitted of the severity of church-discipline, for fear of these wicked ones that are enemies of priests and rebels against God's Church; whom God will undoubtedly much more severely punish than they were who in the time of the law of Moses despised the high priest, and other priests and rulers of the people; who yet answered such their contempts with their blood: and then addeth the words cited by Bellarmine, that² "hence all heresies

Cyprianus, Lib. i. Epist. iii. ad Cornelium, ubi loquens de schismate Novatianorum, qui non agnoscebant Cornelium pontificem, sic ait, &c." —Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

¹ "Legi literas tuas, frater carissime, quas per Saturum fratrem nostrum acoluthum misisti, et dilectionis fraternæ et ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ et sacerdotalis censuræ satis plenas; quibus significasti Felicissimum hostem Christi non novum sed jampridem ob crimina sua plurima et gravissima abstentum, et non tantum mea, sed plurimorum coepiscoporum sententia condemnatum rejectum a te illic esse, et cum venisset stipatus caterva et factione desperatorum vigore pleno quo episcopos agere oportet pulsum de ecclesia esse." —Lib. i. Epist. iii. [Al. Epist. lix. p. 126.]

² "Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur. Cui si secundum magisteria divina obtemperaret fraternitas universa nemo adversum sacerdotum collegium quidquam moveret; nemo post di-

and schisms do arise, for that the priest of God is not obeyed, nor one priest in the Church for the time, and one judge in Christ's stead for the time acknowledged; whom, if men would obey according to the divine instructions, no man would attempt any thing against the college of priests, no man after the judgment of God, the voices of the people, and the consent of fellow-bishops, would make himself a judge, not so much of the bishops as of God himself; no man pleasing himself would bring in any new heresy or schism to the rending and dividing of the Church; as if, when a sparrow falleth not to the ground without the will of our Father, it were possible that he who is ordained a bishop in the Church, should be ordained without the will of God." "Surely," saith he¹, "I speak it provoked, I speak it grieved and constrained, when a bishop is placed in the room of one that is dead, chosen in peace by all the people, protected by divine help in the time of persecution, faithfully conjoined with all his colleagues, approved to his people four years in his bishoply office, in the time of peace keeping the rules of discipline, proscribed in the times of trouble, so often even with addition of the title of bishop, called for to be cast to the lion, and even in these very days wherein I write unto thee, called for again to the lion; if such an one be impugned by a few desperate and wicked ones, it will easily appear who they are that so impugn him." All these things

vinum judicium, post populi suffragium, post coepiscoporum consensum judicem se jam non episcopi sed Dei faceret: nemo dissidio unitatis Christi ecclesiam scinderet; nemo sibi placens ac tumens seorsim foris hæresim novam conderet, nisi si ita est aliquis sacrilegæ temeritatis ac perditæ mentis ut putet sine Dei judicio fieri sacerdotem, cum Dominus in evangelio suo dicat: 'Nonne duo passeret asse veneunt, et neuter eorum cadit in terram sine Patris voluntate?'—[Ibid. p. 129.]

¹ "Cæterum (dico enim provocatus, dico dolens, dico compulsus) quando episcopus in locum defuncti substituitur, quando populi universi suffragio in pace deligitur, quando Dei auxilio in persecutione protegitur, collegis omnibus fideliter junctus, plebi suæ in episcopatu quadriennio jam probatus, in quiete serviens disciplinæ; in tempestate proscriptus, applicito et adjuncto episcopatus sui nomine, toties ad leonem petitus, in circo in amphitheatro Dominicæ dignationis testimonio honoratus; his ipsis etiam diebus quibus has ad te literas feci ob sacrificia quæ edicto proposito celebrare populus jubebatur clamore popularium ad leonem denuo postulatus in circo, cum talis frater carissime a quibusdam desperatis et perditis, et extra ecclesiam constitutis impugnari videtur, apparet quis impugnet."—[Ibid. p. 130.]

are spoken by Cyprian of his own case, as most clearly appeareth by his sixty-ninth epistle; and therefore the words are strangely wrested by Bellarmine to prove the papacy, when Cyprian speaketh of the respect that is due to the bishop of every particular Church, and, by application thereof to himself, sheweth Cornelius how little he had been respected, and how grievously he hath been wronged. But the cardinal will prove that he speaketh of the Pope when he speaketh of one pastor, and of one judge in the Church for the time, and not of every bishop or pastor in his own particular Church; first, because in the book *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, he maketh Peter head and commander of all the Church, and saith heresies spring from the not seeking to this head; than which nothing is more untrue: for Cyprian doth not make Peter head and commander over the whole Church, as I have already showed in answer to the former allegation. Secondly, for that when he speaketh of one judge in the Church instead of Christ, he must of necessity by the name of the Church understand the universal Church, and not each particular Church, because in his epistle he speaketh of Cornelius. A strange kind of proof, and such as I think can never be made good: for first, the consequence doth not hold, seeing he might speak of Cornelius, and yet understand by the name of the Church the diocese of Rome, and not the universal Church; and, secondly, it is untrue that he saith he speaketh of Cornelius; for it is as clear as the sun at noon-day, that throughout the whole epistle he complaineth of contempts, indignities, and wrongs offered to himself by Felicissimus and Fortunatus, and not to Cornelius. But that Cyprian never acknowledged the supremacy of power which the Roman bishops at this day claim, no better proof can be desired than this epistle will yield. For these miscreants, Felicissimus, Fortunatus, and their adherents, fled to Cornelius, complaining against Cyprian; whom he peremptorily condemneth for this their flying to Rome, as violators of the canons, and disturbers of the order of the Church, which requireth all matters to be heard and determined in those places where the accusers and witnesses may be produced; "unless," saith he, "a few desperate and wicked companions do think the authority of the African bishops to be less than the authority of the other bishops elsewhere, and therefore carry things out of Africa by way

of appeal to other places." So that when he calleth the Church of Rome the principal Church, whence sacerdotal unity sprang, his meaning is, that it is the principal Church in order and honour, and not in absolute, supreme, commanding power: and that sacerdotal unity sprang from thence, not as if all bishops did receive their power and jurisdiction from the bishop of Rome, but for that, though all receive their bishoply commission immediately from Christ, by the hands of the apostles ordaining them, yet he is to be acknowledged as first in the commission succeeding Peter, to whom Christ first promised that which he meant afterwards in as ample sort to give to all the rest.

For answer to the third allegation, we must observe that Cyprian in the epistle¹ cited by Bellarmine, laboureth to satisfy Cornelius bishop of Rome, who was something offended with him, for that presently, so soon as he heard of his ordination, he did not write unto him as to his fellow-bishop. To this purpose he sheweth, that he refrained and forbore so to do, till he was by others assured of his due and orderly election and ordination, as well as by himself, because he perceived there was some opposition against him; but that as soon as his ordination was approved unto him, hearing of some factious and turbulent men stirring against him, he sent certain of his brethren and colleagues, to put to their helping hands for the bringing of the divided members of the body to the unity of the catholic Church, if by any means it might be; but that the obstinacy of the one part was such, that they not only refused the bosom of the root and common mother, seeking to receive and embrace them, but set up another head or bishop; where it is plain and evident that he speaketh not of the universal Church, the common mother of all believers, but of that particular Church of Rome, whereof Cornelius was bishop, opposite to the divisions of such as departed from the unity of it, who being gone out of the bosom and lap of it, chose a bishop of their own faction.

The fourth and last allegation will easily be answered, if we do but take a view of that which Cyprian writeth in the epistle alleged. "There is," saith he², "one God, one Christ,

¹ Lib. II. Ep. x. ad Cornel. [Al. Epist. xlv. p. 86, passim.]

² "Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui, aut

one Church, one chair founded upon Peter by the Lord's own voice. No other altar may be raised, nor other new priesthood appointed, besides that one altar and one priesthood already appointed. Whosoever gathereth anywhere else, scattereth." Surely it is not possible that the cardinal should think, as he pretendeth to do, that Cyprian speaketh of one singular chair ordained by Christ for one bishop to sit in, appointed to teach all the world. For the question in this place is not touching obedience to be yielded to the bishop of Rome, that Cyprian should need to urge that point, but touching certain schismatics which opposed themselves against him; and therefore he urgeth the unity of the Church and of the chair, to show, that against them that are lawfully placed, with consenting allowance of the pastors at unity, others may not be admitted; and that they, who by any other means get into the places of ministry, than by the consenting allowance of the pastors at unity amongst themselves, are in truth and in deed no bishops at all. So that Cyprian, by that one chair he mentioneth, understandeth not one particular chair appointed for a general teacher of all the world to sit in, but the joint commission, unity, and consent of all pastors, which is and must be such as if they did all sit in one chair.

Hitherto we have heard what can be alleged out of Cyprian's writings, to prove the supreme commanding authority of the pope. Now let us hear what may be alleged out of the same for the improving thereof. First, in his book *Of the Unity of the Church* he saith¹, "There is one episcopal office whereof every one equally and indifferently hath his part;" and secondly, in the council of Carthage holden by him²

sacerdotium novum fieri præter unum altare, et unum sacerdotium non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit.—Lib. i. Epist. viii. Ad plebem univer. [Al. Epist. xliii. p. 83.]

¹ "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur."—De Unit. Eccles. [p. 108.]

² "Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non potest quam nec ipse potest judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi qui unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi."—Concil. Carthag. inter Opera Cypriani. [p. 229.]

and other bishops of Africa, he saith: "None of us maketh himself a bishop of bishops, or tyrannically enforceth his colleagues to a necessity of obeying, because every bishop hath his own free judgment and disposition, and may neither judge other, nor be judged of other, but must all expect the judgment of God, who only hath power to set us over his Church, and to judge of our actions." To the first of these authorities Bellarmine¹ answereth, that each bishop hath his part in the episcopal office and communion, equally, and as well as any other, but not an equal part: "For Peter and his successors have that part, that is as the root, head, and fountain; the rest, those parts that are as the branches, members, and rivers, and that therefore Peter's successors are to rule and govern the rest." But this answer is refuted by the other place, where Cyprian with the whole council of Carthage saith: "None of us maketh himself a bishop of bishops, or goeth about tyrannically to enforce others to a necessity of obeying, seeing each bishop hath his liberty, and no one may judge another, nor be judged of another, but must all expect the judgment of God." If he reply, that this which Cyprian speaketh of the equality of bishops, is to be understood of the bishops of Carthage, amongst whom none was found that had power to command over others, and not generally so as to include the bishop of Rome, he is refuted by Cyprian himself: who in his epistle to Stephen² bishop of Rome, having freely dissented from him, and showed the reasons of his so dissenting, *pro communi honore, et simplici dilectione*: that is, "for the fellowship they have in the same honourable calling and employment, and the simplicity and singleness of his love," saith, "he hopeth Stephen will approve that which is true and right, and which he hath so strongly confirmed and proved, though there be some (so taxing him in a sort as too stiffly cleaving to his own opinion) that will not easily alter their minds, but holding communion with their colleagues, stiffly maintain what they have once conceived. Wherein," saith he,

¹ "Unius igitur magni episcopatus ab episcopis singulis in solidum pars tenetur, sed non æqualis, neque eodem modo. Nam Petrus et ejus successores tenent eam partem quæ est veluti caput et radix et fons; cæteri tenent alias partes quæ sunt veluti rami et rivi."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 16. [Tom. I. p. 320.]

² Cyprian. Lib. II. Epist. I. [Al. Epist. lxxii. p. 197.]

Nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, cum habeat in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus: that is, “Neither do we force any man, or give a law unto any man, whereas every governor hath the free disposition of his own will in the administration of the Church, being to give an account of his actions unto the Lord.” Here we see Cyprian speaketh in the very same sort in the case between him and Stephen, as he did in the council of Carthage, and that generally he maketh all bishops equal, and no one subject to the judgment of another, but to the judgment of God only, and the company of their fellow-bishops. And that he did not think the bishop of Rome to have an infallibility of judgment, or a commanding authority over other bishops, it appeareth, in that writing to Pompeius¹ of Stephen’s answer to his letters, and sending him a copy of the same answer, he telleth him, that by reading it he may more and more note his error in maintaining the cause of heretics against Christians and the Church of God: and feareth not to pronounce of him, that he writeth many things proudly, impertinently, unskilfully, improvidently, and contrary to himself: and, which more is, contemning his prescription, that heretics should not be rebaptized, but be received with the imposition of hands only, he chargeth him with hard, stiff, and inflexible obstinacy. Firmilianus², with the bishops of Phrygia, Galatia, Cilicia, and other regions near adjoining, assembled in a synod at Iconium, consented with Cyprian:

¹ “Quia desiderasti in notitiam tuam perferri quæ mihi ad litteras nostras Stephanus frater noster rescripserit, misi tibi rescripti ejus exemplum; quo lecto magis ac magis ejus errorem denotabis qui hæreticorum causam contra Christianos et contra ecclesiam Dei asserere conatur. Nam inter cætera vel superba vel ad rem non pertinentia vel sibi ipsi contraria, quæ imperite atque improvide scripsit, etiam illud adjunxit ut diceret: ‘Si quis ergo a quacunque hæresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in poenitentiam: cum ipsi hæretici proprie alterutrum ad se venientes non baptizent, sed communicent tantum.’”—Epist. lxxiv. [p. 210.]

² “Non pudet Stephanum talibus adversus ecclesiam patrociniū præstare, et propter hæreticos asserendos fraternitatem scindere; insuper et Cyprianum pseudo-Christum et pseudo-apostolum et dolosum operarium dicere. Qui omnia in se esse conscius prævenit; ut alteri ea per mendacium objiceret quæ ipse ex merito audire deberet.”—Firmilianus, in Epist. lxxv. inter Epist. Cypriani. [p. 229.]

and Firmilianus writing to him, telleth him of their resolution, and chargeth Stephen with folly, who bragging of the place of his bishopric, and pretending to succeed Peter on whom the Church was founded, yet bringeth in many other rocks, and new buildings of many Churches, in that he supposed heretics to be truly baptized, who are out of the communion of the true Church; whereas the Church was specially promised to be builded on Peter, to show that it must be but one. And in great dislike and reprehension of Stephen, he saith, he was not ashamed in favour of heretics to divide the brotherhood, and to call Cyprian, the worthy servant of God, a false Christ, a false apostle, and a deceitful and guileful workman: whereas all these things might much more truly be said of him, and therefore guilty to himself, *Prævenit, ut alteri ea per mendacium objiceret, quæ ipse ex merito audire deberet*: that is, "By way of prevention, he falsely and lyingly objected those things to another, which himself truly and deservedly might have had objected to him by others." Such and so great were the oppositions of Cyprian and his consorts, against Stephen and his adherents, in the matter of rebaptization: whereupon Bellarmine¹ saith, it seemeth that Cyprian sinned mortally, in that he obeyed not the commandment of Stephen, nor submitted his judgment to the judgment of his superior. That he erred in the matter of rebaptization, we willingly confess: but, that he knew not the power, authority, and commission of the bishop of Rome, or that he would ever have dissented from him, or opposed himself against him in a question of faith, if he had thought his power to be universal, and his judgment infallible, we utterly deny. For then he should not only have erred in the matter of rebaptization, but have been a damnable heretic, and have perished everlastingly: whereas yet the Church of God hath ever reputed him a holy bishop, and a blessed martyr. Thus having examined the testimonies of Cyprian usually alleged for and against the su-

¹ "An peccaverit Cyprianus mortaliter non obediendo pontifici non est omnino certum. Nam ex una parte non videtur mortaliter peccasse, quia non peccavit nisi ex ignorantia, putavit enim pontificem perniciose errare....Ex altera autem parte videtur mortaliter peccasse cum præcepto expresso apostolico non paruerit, et sine modo pontificem recte sentientem vexaverit."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv, Cap. 7. [Tom. i. p. 399.]

premacý of the pope, let us proceed to the rest of Bellarmine's witnesses.

The next that followeth is Optatus, out of whom it is alleged that there was one episcopal chair in the whole Church appointed by Christ¹. But, because this is the same which was formerly alleged out of Cyprian, and already answered in the answers to the allegations brought out of him, therefore, without farther troubling of the reader, I refer him to that which went before.

The next unto Optatus is Ambrose², out of whom three several places are produced: in the first, his words are these, as Bellarmine citeth them: "Though the whole world be God's, yet the Church only is called his house, the governor whereof at this day is Damasus." For answer hereunto we say, that this testimony rather witnesseth their forgery, than confirmeth their error. For the commentaries attributed to Ambrose, wherein these words are, are not his: and besides, this addition, "the governor whereof at this day is Damasus," may be thought to have been put in in favour of their fancy touching the papal universality of jurisdiction; it is so sudden, causeless, and abrupt. In the second place, Ambrose³ reporteth of Satyrus, that before he would receive the sacrament of the Lord's body, he asked of the bishop by whose hands he was to receive it, whether he held communion with the catholic bishops, and namely, with the Roman Church? To the inference of our adversaries, and the conclusion they seek to derive and draw from these words in favour of the papacy, I have answered elsewhere⁴, whither I refer the reader. Wherefore let us come to the third and last place of Ambrose. His words are: "We follow the type and form of

¹ "Negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma primo cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium apostolorum caput Petrus; unde et Cephas appellatus est; in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servatur."—Optat. contr. Parmen. Lib. ii. [cap. 2. p. 28. Par. 1700.]

² "Cum totus mundus Dei sit ecclesia tamen domus ejus dicitur cujus hodie rector est Damasus."—[Pseud. Ambros.] In 1 Tim. iii. [Tom. ii. Append. col. 296.]

³ "Percunctatus episcopum est, utrumnam cum episcopis catholicis, hoc est, si cum Romana ecclesia conveniret."—Ambros. In Orat. in Satyrum. [Tom. ii. col. 1127.]

⁴ Book iii. chap. 41. [Vol. i. p. 336.]

the Roman Church in all things¹;" and again, "I desire to follow the Roman Church in all things." Surely, this place of all other most clearly confuteth the error of the Romanists, touching the infallibility of the judgment of the Roman Church and bishop, and the necessity of absolute conformity with the same. For in this place Saint Ambrose sheweth, that in the Church of Milan, whereof he was bishop, the manner in his time was, that the bishop girding himself about with a towel, in imitation of Christ, did wash the feet of such as were newly baptized; and after great commendation of the same custom, objecting to himself that the Roman Church had it not; first he saith, that perhaps the Church of Rome omitted this washing because of the difficulty and great labour in performing it, by reason of the multitude of those that were baptized. Secondly, whereas some said, in defence and excuse of the omission of this washing in the Roman Church, that it is not to be used as a mystical rite in the regeneration of them that are new born in Christ, but in the civil entertainment of strangers (the offices of humility and civil courtesy being very far different from the mysteries and sacred rites of sanctification), he reproveth them for so saying, and endeavoureth to show that this kind of washing is a sacred and mystical rite, tending to the sanctification of them that are newly baptized, and that out of the words of Christ to Peter, "Unless I wash thee, thou shalt have no part in me:" and then addeth the words alleged by Bellarmine, "I desire in all things to follow the Roman Church; but notwithstanding we also are men, and have our sense and judgment; and therefore what we find to be rightly observed anywhere else, we also rightly observe and keep: we follow the apostle Peter, we cleave fast unto his devotion, and hereunto what can the Church of Rome answer²?" Whereby we may see with what conscience these men allege the testimonies of the fathers. Ambrose saith, "Other men have judgment to discern what is fit to be

¹ "Non ignoramus quod ecclesia Romana hanc consuetudinem non habeat, cujus typum in omnibus sequimur et formam....In omnibus cupio sequi ecclesiam Romanam; sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus, ideo quod alibi rectius servatur et nos rectius custodimus."

² "Ipsam sequimur apostolum Petrum, ipsius inhæremus devotioni. Ad hoc ecclesia Romana quid respondet?"—Id. De Sacram. Lib. III. cap. 1. [Tom. II. col. 362, 3.]

done, as well as the Romans: that if anywhere else they find better observations than in the Church of Rome, they may lawfully embrace them; that St Peter bishop of Rome was author of his assertion; and that the Church of Rome hath nothing to answer in her own defence, or whereby to justify her omitting of this sacred washing:" and they produce his testimony to prove that he thought it necessary to be like in all things to the Church of Rome. Neither doth Bellarmine's¹ answer, that he thought it necessary to follow the Church of Rome in all things necessary to salvation, though he dissented in this observation, satisfy us; seeing he thought this observation necessary to the perfect regeneration of the baptized, and consequently to salvation, as appeareth in the place itself. Wherefore, when Ambrose saith of himself, and those of Milan, that they follow in all things the type and form of the Roman Church, it is not to be understood without all limitation: but that as other daughter-churches do follow the custom of their mother-churches, so the Church of Milan conformeth herself to the Church of Rome in all things, so far forth as she can persuade herself it is fit and right so to do: otherwise, out of her judgment and discretion receiving from other Churches that which they have in better sort than she; even as Gregory bishop of Rome² professed, that he was not ashamed to learn of those Churches that were meaner than his own.

From Ambrose the cardinal passeth to Hierome, out of whose writings he produceth two testimonies. The first, out of his epistle to Ageruchia, *de Monogamia*; the other out of his epistle to Damasus touching the use of the word *Hypostasis*. The first of these two testimonies might well have been spared. For what can any man infer from this that Hierome³ saith, "he did help Damasus in writing answers to the synodal consultations of the East and West?" Was there

¹ "Observandum est, cum Ambrosius dicat in omnibus se velle sequi Romanam ecclesiam, et tamen eam sequi nolit in consuetudine non lavandi pedes recens baptizatis, illud, 'in omnibus,' intelligendum esse de omnibus necessariis et ad salutem pertinentibus, alioqui secum pugnaret."—[Bellarm. ubi supra.]

² Greg. Epist. Lib. vii. Epist. lxiii. [?]

³ "Ante annos plurimos cum chartis ecclesiasticis juvarem Damasum, Romanæ urbis episcopum, et orientis atque occidentis synodicis consultationibus responderem," &c.—Hieron. Ad Ageruchiam De Monogamia. [Tom. i. col. 901.]

ever any man that doubted of the consulting of the bishop of Rome, and his bishops, by the synods of the East and West, in matters concerning the faith, and state of the universal Church? Or may it be concluded from hence, that the pope hath an absolute supreme power in the Church? Surely, I think not. Wherefore let us pass to the second testimony. *Ego*, saith Hierome to Damasus¹, *nullum primum nisi Christum sequens, beatitudini tuæ, id est, cathedræ Petri, communione consocior : super illam petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio. Quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit, profanus est. Si quis in arca Noe non fuerit, peribit regnante diluvio ;* that is, “ I following no first and chief but Christ, am joined in communion to your blessedness, that is, to Peter’s chair. Upon that rock I know the Church to be builded : whosoever shall eat the paschal lamb out of this house, he is a profane person. If any man shall be out of Noah’s ark, he shall undoubtedly perish, when the flood prevaieth and drowneth all.” It is true, that Cyprian² hath observed, in his epistle to Stephen bishop of Rome, that therefore Almighty God appointed a great number and company of bishops, joined together by the glue and bond of unity, that if some fall into heresy, and seek to waste the flock of Christ, the rest may gather the dispersed sheep into the fold again ; and therefore even as if one haven be dangerous, they that sail will seek to

¹ Epist. ad Damas. [Epist. xv. Tom. i. col. 38.]

² “Idcirco frater carissime, copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordie mutue glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresin facere, et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri, et quasi pastores utiles et misericordes oves Dominicas in gregem colligant. Quid enim si in mari portus aliquis munitionibus suis ruptis infestus et periculosus esse navibus cœperit, nonne navigantes ad alios proximos portus naves suas dirigunt, ubi sit tutus et salutaris introitus et statio segura? Aut si in via stabulum aliquod obsideri et teneri a latronibus cœperit, ut quisquis ingressus fuerit insidiantium illic infestatione capiatur, nonne commeantes, hac opinione comperta, stabula alia in itinere appetunt tutiora, ubi sint fida hospitia et receptacula commeantibus tuta? Quod nunc esse apud nos debet, frater carissime, ut fratres nostros qui vitatis Marciani scopulis petunt ecclesiæ portus salutare suscipiamus ad nos prompta et benigna humanitate, et stabulum commeantibus præbeamus tale quale est in evangelio, quo a latronibus sauciati et vulnerati suscipi et foveri et tutari ab stabulario possint.”—Cyprian. Epist. lxvii. [Al. Epist. lxviii. p. 178.]

another more safe, and if one inn upon the way be possessed by thieves and wicked persons, wayfaring men will turn into another; so in the Church, when the pastors of one part of it are infected with error and heresy, men must fly to them that are right believers in other parts. This was the case of Hierome, as it appeareth by this his epistle. He lived at the time of the writing of it in the east parts, where Arianism had strangely and dangerously prevailed, but the west Churches were sound. He was urged to confess and acknowledge that there are three hypostases or subsistences in the Godhead. This form of speaking he suspected, as fearing some ill-meaning, especially because he suspected them that tendered it to him; and therefore flieth for direction to Damasus and the western bishops. For it appeareth that he sought the resolution of them all, though the manner was to write only to the chief amongst them. Let us hear therefore what it is that he saith, and what the Jesuit inferreth from his saying. "He admitteth," saith Bellarmine¹, "no original teacher but Christ; yet is joined in communion with Damasus, that is, with Peter's chair, and profeseth, that upon that rock the Church was builded. Therefore he acknowledgeth the universality of papal power and jurisdiction." This argument of the cardinal is too weak to prove the intended conclusion. For though there be no question but that in a true sense the Church may be said to have been builded on Peter's chair, that is, upon his office and ministry, yet it will not follow that they who succeed him in that chair have universality of power and jurisdiction: seeing Hierome² himself teacheth, that the Church

¹ "Observe primo, Hieronymum qui presbyter Antiochenus erat tamen ovem se agnoscere episcopi Romani.

"Secundo, confiteri Hieronymum Damasum esse Petri successorem.

"Tertio, cum dicit, 'Ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequens beatitudini tuæ communione consocior,' velle dicere se primum Christo, deinde Christi vicario adhærere. Idem enim est ac si dixisset, 'Ego neminem tibi, Damase pontifex, nisi Christum præpono.'

"Quarto, a Hieronymo Romani pontificis sedem fieri fundamentum ejus domus et navis quæ est ecclesia universalis, ac proinde Romanum pontificem fieri caput totius ecclesiæ."—[Bellarm. ubi supra.]

² "At dicis super Petrum fundatur ecclesia; licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant, et ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur."—Hieron. Advers. Jovinian. Lib. I. [Tom. II. col. 279.]

is builded as well upon the rest of the apostles as upon Peter, and consequently that their chairs are that rock upon which the Church is builded, as well as Peter's. And yet besides all this, Gregory¹ sheweth that Peter's chair being but one, is in three several places, and three bishops do sit in it. For Peter's chair is at Alexandria, where he taught and ruled by Mark his scholar; at Antioch, where he remained for a time; and at Rome, where in his body he yet still abideth, expecting the second coming of Christ. Upon this chair, as on a rock, the Church is builded. But this chair and throne implieth not only the office and ministry of them who most specially succeed Peter, as the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, but of such other also as in joint commission with them govern the Church. Whereupon, according to the phrase of antiquity², the judgment of the Roman see, and the judgment of the bishop of Rome with his fellow-bishops of the West, is all one. But some man will say, that Hierome pronounceth him to be a profane person that eateth the lamb out of this house, speaking of the Church of Rome: therefore he thinketh all men and Churches bound for ever to hold communion with the Roman Church. For answer to this objection, first we say, it may very probably be thought, that by the house he speaketh of, out of which the lamb may not be eaten, he meaneth not particularly the Roman Church, but the true catholic Church of Christ, which is equally builded upon all the apostles, in respect of the same firmness found in them all; but more specially upon Peter, as in order and honour the chiefest of them; and then there is no question but all men are bound for ever to adhere to this Church,

¹ "Itaque cum multi sint apostoli, pro ipso tamen principatu sola apostolorum principis sedes in auctoritate convaluit, quæ in tribus locis unius est. Ipse enim sublimavit sedem in qua etiam quiescere et præsentem vitam finire dignatus est. Ipse decoravit sedem in qua evangelistam discipulum misit. Ipse firmavit sedem, in qua septem annis quamvis discessurus sedit. Cum ergo unius atque una sit sedes, cui ex auctoritate divina tres nunc episcopi præident, quidquid ego de vobis boni audio hoc mihi imputo."—Greg. Magn. Lib. vi. Epist. xxxvii. [Al. Lib. vii. Epist. xl. Tom. ii. col. 888.]

² Vide apud Binium Epist. Nicholai Ignatio Constantinopolitano. Tom. iii. Concil. Part. 2. p. 879. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 778.] et alteram epist. ejusd. p. 889. [Labbe, col. 834.] et Orat. Basilii Imperatoris. p. 859. [Labbe, col. 563.]

and to eat the lamb within the walls of this house. That this is the meaning of Hierome, the very form of his words do persuade us. "I am joined," saith he, "to Peter's chair: upon that rock the Church is builded: out of this house (of the Church, doubtless) the lamb may not be eaten." Now by the name of the Church immediately going before, is meant the universal Church: therefore by this house we must understand that great house, within the walls whereof the whole household of faith is contained. Secondly, we say, that if he speak of the Roman or west Church particularly, he may be thought to mean, not that he shall perpetually and always be judged a profane person that eateth the lamb without the walls of that house; but things so standing as they did when he wrote, no other parts of the Church being sound, safe, and free from heresies, but the western parts only. Which made him say, he knew not Paulinus, who was then bishop of Antioch, within the compass of whose patriarchship he lived, because there was question as well of his faith, as of the lawfulness of his ordination: for otherwise he ought to have known him, sought to him, and respected him. Thirdly, we say it is more than probable, that the whole west Church shall never lose or forsake the true profession, and that therefore he may rightly be judged a profane person that eateth the paschal lamb out of the communion of the same; though sometimes the bishop of Rome in person be an heretic, other of his colleagues continuing faithful. And that Hierome¹ was of opinion that the bishop of Rome may become an heretic, it is most clear and evident, in that he saith that both Liberius and Felix were Arian heretics.

Thus have we answered whatsoever may be alleged out of Hierome for the papacy, and showed the weakness of those allegations. Now let us see what authorities may be brought out of his writings against the absolute supreme power of popes. First, he saith², "If we seek authority," *Orbis major*

¹ "Fortunatianus....in hoc habetur detestabilis, quod Liberium Romanæ urbis episcopum, pro fide ad exilium pergentem, primus sollicitavit ac fregit, et ad subscriptionem hæreseos compulit.

"Acacius....in tantum sub Constantio imperatore claruit, ut in Liberii locum Romæ Felicem (Arianum) constituit."—Hieron. In Catalog. Viror. Illustr. De Fortunatiano et Acacio. [Sive De Viris Illustr. capp. 97, 8. Tom. II. col. 917.]

² Hieron. ad Evagr. [Sive Evangelum. Ep. cxlvi. Tom. I. col. 1076.]

est urbe: “The world is greater than the greatest city in the world, and the whole Church is of greater authority than the particular Church of Rome:” and thereupon reprehendeth the negligence or error of the Church of Rome, in permitting, contrary to the manner of other Churches, deacons to grow so insolent as to dare to sit in the presence of the presbyters when the bishop was away; as also in ordaining presbyters upon the commendation of deacons. So that he blamed not the deacons only, as Bellarmine¹ untruly saith, but the Roman bishop, to whom the ordaining of presbyters pertained. Neither will it follow that the insolency of the deacons presuming to sit in the presence of presbyters was unknown to the bishop, or not allowed by the Church, as Bellarmine collecteth, because they are said so to have done when the bishop was away. For that circumstance rather insinuateth that though they had not cast off all respect to the bishop, yet they had forgotten their duty towards the presbyters, than that this their presuming was unknown to the bishop. Secondly, he pronounceth² “that wheresoever a bishop be, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or Rhegium, at Alexandria or Tanais, he is of the same merit, and the same priesthood; the power of riches, and the humility of poor estate, not making a bishop higher or lower.” To this place Bellarmine answereth, that all bishops are equal in the power of order, but not of jurisdiction. But it is certain, Hierome thought all bishops equal, not only in the power of order, but of jurisdiction also. For metropolitans, in his time, though in order and honour greater than the rest, were bound to follow what the greater part of the bishops of the province consented on, and might do nothing but as the greater part should resolve; howsoever, in process of time, by positive constitution, the metropolitans, limited and directed by canons,

¹ “Dico Hieronymum eo loco reprehendere malam quandam consuetudinem quæ Romæ erat, non in tota ecclesia Romana, vel in summo pontifice, sed in diaconis tantum Romanis.

“Quod autem Romanus pontifex non probaret eam consuetudinem ibidem Hieronymus indicat. Dicit enim solum absente episcopo ausum fuisse diaconum inter presbyteros sedere.”—[Bellarm. ubi supra.]

² “Ubique fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Ugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti est, et ejusdem sacerdotii; potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas sublimiorem vel inferiorem episcopum non facit.”—[Hieron. ubi supra.]

were trusted with the doing of many things by themselves alone, rather than the bishops would be troubled with often meeting in councils. "But," saith Bellarmine¹, "it cannot be that Hierome should think all bishops equal in the power of jurisdiction, seeing, without all question, the bishop of Alexandria, having under him three great provinces, was greater in jurisdiction than the bishop of Tanais, who had under him only one poor little city." For answer hereunto we say, that patriarchs have no more power over the metropolitans subject to them, than the metropolitans have over the bishops of the province; and that therefore, howsoever the extent of their power reach farther, yet proportionably it is no greater than the power of the metropolitans within their narrower precincts and compass, and that the metropolitan, originally, is not greater in the power of jurisdiction than any other bishop of the province, howsoever he have a pre-eminence of honour, and sit as a president among the bishops meeting to perform the acts of jurisdiction, and by common consent to manage the affairs of the province: so that, notwithstanding anything the cardinal can say to the contrary, the testimonies and authorities of Hierome stand good against the pope's proud claim of universal power.

Wherefore, leaving Hierome, who witnesseth not for them but against them, let us hear whether Augustine will say anything for them. Out of Augustine sundry things are alleged: as first, that he saith, "The principality and chieftly of the apostolical chair did ever flourish in the Roman Church²:" and secondly, that to Bonifacius he saith, "Thou disdainest not to be a friend of the humble, and those of the mean sort; and though thou sit in higher place, yet thou art not high-minded³:" and again, "The watch-tower is common to us all

¹ "Illud autem quod Hieronymus dicit, episcopos 'esse ejusdem meriti et sacerdotii' verum est, sed intelligi debet de episcopatu ratione ordinis, non jurisdictionis. Nec enim negare voluit Hieronymus majorem esse ditionem episcopi Alexandrini quam Tanensis, cum constet illum tribus magnis provinciis, istum uni tantum civitatulæ præfuisse." —[Bellarm. ubi supra.]

² "Ecclesia semper apostolicæ cathedræ viguit principatus." — Aug. Epist. clxii. [Al. Epist. xliii. Tom. II. col. 91.]

³ "Neque dedignaris qui non alta sapis quamvis altius præsideas esse amicus humilium." — Idem. Lib. I. ad Bonifac. cap. 1. [Tom. x. col. 411. B.]

that are bishops, although thou hast a higher room in the same¹." Surely it is strange to what purpose these places of Augustine are alleged. For we never denied a principality or chiefly of order and honour to have belonged anciently to the bishops of Rome, whilst they rested contented therewith, and sought not to bring all under them by claim of universal power: and this is all that can be collected out of Augustine. "But," saith Bellarmine, "in his epistle to Optatus², speaking of a meeting of bishops at Cæsarea, he saith, 'an ecclesiastical necessity laid upon them by the reverend pope Zosimus, bishop of the apostolical see, drew them thither:' therefore he thought the bishop of Rome superior unto other bishops, not in order and honour only, but in power of commanding also." For answer hereunto, first we say, that a great part of Africa was within the precincts of the patriarchship of Rome, and that therefore the bishop of Rome might call the bishops of those parts to a synodal meeting, as every patriarch may do the bishops under him, though he had no commanding power over all the world. Secondly, that in a matter of faith concerning the whole state of the Church, Zosimus, as in order and honour first amongst bishops, might urge them by virtue of the canons appointing such meetings, to meet together in a synod for the suppressing of such heresies as he found to arise amongst them, and might justly threaten, if they should refuse so to do, to reject them from the communion of the bishops and Churches adhering to him, and thereby lay an ecclesiastical necessity upon them, without any claim of universal power. Neither doth the next place (wherein Augustine³, and the bishops assembled in the council of Milevis, desire Inno-

¹ "Communis est omnibus nobis qui fungimur episcopatus officio, quamvis in eo præemineas celsiore fastigio, specula pastoralis."—Ibid. [Contr. Duas Epist. Pelagianorum. Tom. x. col. 411.]

² "Me apud Cæsaream præsentē venerunt quo nos injuncta nobis a venerabili papa Zosimo, apostolicæ sedis episcopo, ecclesiastica necessitas traxerat," &c.—Id. Epist. clvii. [Al. Epist. cxc. col. 700.]

³ "Quia te Dominus gratiæ suæ præcipuo munere in sede apostolica collocavit, talemque nostris temporibus præstitit, ut nobis potius ad culpam negligentiae valeat, si apud tuam venerationem quæ pro ecclesia suggerenda sunt tacuerimus, quam ea tu possis vel fastidiose vel negligenter accipere, magnis periculis infirmorum membrorum Christi pastorem diligentiam, quæsumus, adhibere digneris."—Id. Epist. xcii. ad Innocent. [Al. Epist. clxxvi. col. 620.]

centius to concur with them in suppressing the heresies of the Pelagians, which sought to spread themselves into all parts of the world, and to use his pastoral care and diligence for the preventing of the dangers of the weak members of Christ) yield any better proof, that they reputed him universal bishop. For what do they here attribute to the bishop of Rome, that Cyprian¹, writing to Stephen in the case of Martianus bishop of Arle, doth not assume to himself and other his colleagues, saying of himself and them, that they are bound to use all diligence to gather together, and call back the erring sheep of Christ, to apply the medicine of fatherly piety for the curing of the wounds and hurts of such as are fallen, to re-collect and cherish all the sheep that Christ purchased with his precious blood, and to know that though they be many pastors yet they feed but one flock? “But,” saith Bellarmine², “why do they not rather write to the patriarch of Jerusalem, to the metropolitan of Palestine, or to the primate of Africa, in which parts of the world Pelagianism specially seemed to prevail, than to the bishop of Rome, if they did not think him to have an universal power?” Surely this question of the cardinal sheweth that either he knoweth not, or careth not what he writeth: for the cause of Pelagius had been often heard and examined by synods of bishops in Palestine; and the primate of Africa³ with his African bishops did write to Innocentius as well as Augustine, and those assembled in the council of Milevis; as well to inform him of the guileful, fraudulent, and slippery dealings of Pelagius, that he might no way be induced to favour him (as some feared not to give out that he did), as also that he might be persuaded to put to his helping hand for

¹ “Quid nos aliud facere oportet, frater carissime, quam colligendis et revocandis Christi ovibus exhibere diligentiam plenam, et curandis lapsorum vulneribus paternæ pietatis adhibere medicinam; quando et Dominus in evangelio moneat et dicat; ‘Non est opus sanis medicus, sed male habentibus.’ Nam etsi pastores multi sumus unum tamen gregem pascimus.”—Cyprian. Lib. III. Epist. 13. [Al. Epist. lxxviii. p. 178.]

² “Deinde cur non scribit Augustinus patriarchæ Hierosolymitano, vel metropolitano Palæstinæ, et primati Africæ Carthaginensi episcopo potius quam Romano pontifici, nisi quia sciebat majorem esse Romani pontificis in Palæstina et Africa auctoritatem quam priorum episcoporum.”—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 16. [Tom. I. p. 322.]

³ Ut patet ex epist. August. supradict. [not. 3. p. 339, supra.]

the suppressing of this heretic, who though condemned by many synods, ceased not to fly from place to place, seeking to spread his heresies; and therefore there was no cause that they should write to either of these.

Thus have our adversaries found nothing in Augustine and the Africans that any way favoureth the pope's proud claim of universal power. Neither do the rest of the witnesses who are next brought forth to give testimony for the pope, depose any more to the purpose than the former have done. For that Prosper¹ saith, "Rome the see of Peter being made the head of pastoral honour to the world, holdeth by religion whatsoever it possesseth, not by force of arms; and that² by reason of the principality of priestly or bishoply dignity, it became greater in respect of the high tower of religion, than the throne of princely power;" that Victor Uticensis³ calleth the Church of Rome "the head of all Churches;" and Hugo de Sancto Victore⁴ saith, "The apostolic see is preferred before all the Churches in the world," is no more than that we ever granted. For they all speak of a chieftly and principality of order and honour, and not of absolute commanding power. And the place which our adversaries bring out of Vincen-tius Lirinensis⁵ to prove the pope to be head of the world, is strangely misalleged. For having spoken of Felix the martyr, and holy Julius bishop of Rome, he addeth, that

¹ "Sedes Roma Petri, quæ pastoralis honoris
Facta caput mundo quidquid non possidet armis
Religione tenet," &c.

Prosper. De ingratis. [Part. i. vers. 40. col. 119. Par. 1711.]

² "Roma per apostolici sacerdotii principatum amplior facta est arce religionis quam solio potestatis."—Id. de Vocat. Gent. Lib. ii. cap. 6. [Leg. 16. col. 905.]

³ "B. Victor Uticensis, Lib. ii. de persecutione Wandalica, ecclesiam Romanam caput appellat omnium ecclesiarum."—[Bellarm. ubi supra.]

⁴ "Apostolica sedes cunctis in orbe terrarum præfertur ecclesiis."—Hugo de Sancto Victore, De Sacram. Fid. Lib. ii. Part. 3. cap. 15. [Tom. iii. p. 448. Mogunt. 1617.]

⁵ "Lectæ sunt ibi quædam ad quosdam epistolæ S. Felicis martyris, et S. Julii, urbis Romæ episcoporum. Et ut non solum caput orbis, verum etiam latera illi judicio testimonium perhiberent, adhibitus a meridie beatissimus Cyprianus, a septentrione S. Ambrosius," &c.—Vincent. Lirin. Commonit. [Cap. 42. Max. Bibl. Vett. Patr. De la Bigne, Tom. vii. p. 262.]

“blessed Cyprian was produced out of the South, and holy Ambrose out of the North, that so not only *caput orbis*, the head of the world, but the sides of it also might give testimony to that judgment; by the head and sides of the world understanding the parts of the world whence these witnesses were produced, and not the witnesses themselves.” So that there is no more reason to infer from hence, that the bishop of Rome is head of all the world, than that Cyprian and Ambrose were the sides of the world. Neither do the testimonies of Cassiodore¹, who attributeth to the bishop of Rome a general care of the whole Christian world, and Beda², who saith, “Leo exercised the priestly office in the Christian world,” make any more for proof of the pope’s universal jurisdiction than the rest that went before. For their sayings argue not an absolute universal commanding power over all, but such a care of the whole as beseemeth him that is in order and honour the chief of bishops, from whom all actions generally concerning the Christian Church are either to take beginning, or at least to be referred before final ending, that so his advice may be had therein. And surely howsoever Anselmus³ saith, “the custody of the faith of Christians and the regiment of the Church is committed to the bishop of Rome;” and Bernard⁴ writeth of

¹ “Vos speculatores Christiano populo præsidetis, vos patris nomine universa diligitis....

“Quapropter nos decet custodire aliqua, sed vos omnia.”—Cassiodor. [Variar.] Lib. xi. Epist. 2. ad Joannem papam. [Tom. i. p. 174. Rothom. 1679.]

² “Cum primum in toto orbe gereret pontificatum [Gregorius], et conversis jam dudum ad fidem veritatis esset prælatus ecclesiis, nostram gentem eatenus idolis mancipatam Christi fecit ecclesiam.”—Bed. Hist. Gent. Anglor. Lib. ii. cap. 1.

³ “Domino et patri universæ ecclesiæ in terra peregrinantis, summo pontifici Urbano frater Anselmus, vita peccator, habitu monachus, sive jubente sive permittente Deo Cantuariæ metropolis vocatus episcopus, debitam subjectionem cum humili servitio et devotis orationibus. Quoniam divina providentia vestram elegit sanctitatem, cui vitam et fidem Christianam custodiendam et ecclesiam suam regendam committeret, ad nullum alium rectius refertur si quid contra catholicam fidem oritur in ecclesia, ut ejus auctoritate corrigatur, nec ulli alii tutius si quid contra errorem respondetur ostenditur, ut prudentia examinetur.”—Anselm. De Incarn. Verb. cap. 1. [Tom. iii. p. 33. Colon. Agripp. 1612.]

⁴ “Age indagemus adhuc diligentius quis sis, quam geras, videlicet

him that he is “chief of bishops, heir of the apostles, in primacy Abel, in government Noah, in patriarchal honour Abraham, in order Melchizedek, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, in judgment Samuel, in power Peter, and in unction Christ; that others have particular flocks assigned to them, but that his charge hath no limits;” with such like hyperbolic amplifications of the pope’s greatness, savouring of the corruption of those late times wherein he lived; yet will it never be proved, that either he, or divers others speaking as he did, were of the papal faction, or believed that the pope hath that universal power and jurisdiction, that is by the Jesuits and other Romanists at this day given unto him. For as John Bacon¹, a learned schoolman, and countryman of ours, hath fitly noted, some attributed all those things whereof Bernard and Anselmus speak, to the pope, as thinking all fulness of ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction to be originally found in him, and that by himself alone he might do all things in the government of the Church, and all other were to receive of his fulness; which is the opinion of our adversaries at this day; other attributed these things unto him, not as having all power in himself alone, but as head and chief of bishops, together with their joint concurrence and assent: so that he had power to judge of the faith, to determine controversies in religion, as patriarch of the West, with the joint consent of his western bishops, and as prime bishop of the world, with an œcumenical synod, wherein he was to sit as an honourable president and moderator, pronouncing according to the

pro tempore, personam in ecclesia Dei. Quis es? Sacerdos magnus, summus pontifex, tu princeps episcoporum, hæres apostolorum, tu primatu Abel, gubernatu Noe, patriarchatu Abraham, ordine Melchizedech, dignitate Aaron, auctoritate Moses, judicatu Samuel, potestate Petrus, unctione Christus. Tu es cui claves traditæ, cui oves creditæ sunt. Sunt quidem et alii cœli janitores, gregumque pastores, sed tu tanto gloriosius, quanto et differentius utrumque præ cæteris nomen hæreditasti.”—Bernard. De Considerat. Lib. II. [Cap. 8. Tom. I. col. 428. Par. 1719.]

¹ “Sub isto universali potestas ligandi tam per legem universalem de universali statu ecclesiæ quam per legem particularem comprehenditur. Ergo omnem legem tam universalem quam particularem licitam, quam cum cardinalibus potest condere, potest per se.”—Joann. Bachon. In IV. Sent. Prolog. Quæst. X. Art. 2. [Tom. II. p. 263. Cremon. 1618.]

resolution of the bishops, and not absolutely disposing things according to his own liking. Neither is it to be doubted but that very many followed this latter opinion, and consequently never gave that fulness of power to the pope that is now claimed, howsoever they attributed that unto him as president of ecclesiastical meetings, which rested not in him alone, but in the whole meetings and assemblies; as it is an ordinary thing to attribute that to the president of any company that is done by the whole company: and as all the great actions of state are attributed to the duke of Venice, whereas yet he can do nothing but as he is swayed and directed by the noble senators of that state.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

OF THE PRETENDED PROOFS OF THE POPE'S UNIVERSAL POWER,
TAKEN FROM HIS INTERMEDDLING IN ANCIENT TIMES IN
CONFIRMING, DEPOSING, OR RESTORING BISHOPS DEPOSED.

HAVING examined the testimonies of councils, popes, and fathers Greek and Latin, brought to prove the universality of ecclesiastical power claimed by the pope, and found their insufficiency and weakness; let us proceed to see by what other proofs our adversaries endeavour to demonstrate and confirm the same. The absolute, supreme power of popes, they labour to prove by the authority they exercised over other bishops; by their laws, dispensations, and censures; by their vicegerents which they appointed in places far remote from them; by appeals brought unto them; by their exemption from being subject to any judgment; and by the names and titles that are given unto them. Of all these I will entreat in order; and first, of the authority the bishops of Rome are supposed to have exercised over other bishops, in confirming, deposing, or restoring them.

Of confirmation Bellarmine¹ bringeth some few examples,

¹ "De institutione multa exempla afferri possent. In concilio Chalcedonensi, act. 7. legimus Maximum Antiochenum a S. Leone

but such as will never confirm the thing he desireth to prove. For touching the confirmation of Maximus in the bishopric of Antioch¹, which is the first example that he bringeth, first, it was not any confirmation of himself in his bishoply office, but only the determining of certain differences between him and Juvenal about their limits, and the confirmation of the same end and conclusion: secondly, this end was not made by Leo alone, but by the whole council of Chalcedon. Neither is the second proof, that the confirmation of the chief bishops of the world pertained anciently to the pope, any better than this. For these are the circumstances of that Leo writeth, whom Bellarmine citeth in the second place, as challenging the right of confirming the bishop of Constantinople. Anatolius, the bishop of Constantinople, ambitiously aspired to be greater than was fit, as Leo thought: Leo² writeth to the emperor in reprehension of his presumption; and saith, that he might have forborne thus ambitiously to aspire higher, seeing he obtained the bishopric of Constantinople by the emperor's help, and his favourable assent. The favour that Leo speaketh of, was in that Anatolius not having passed through the lower degrees of ecclesiastical ministry, was somewhat irregularly preferred to be bishop of so great a city, which he was content to wink at, at the emperor's entreaty. And as the manner was, that the four patriarchs should (upon notice given of their due ordination, and synodal letters containing a profession of their faith) mutually give assent one to another before they were accounted patriarchs, and fully possessed of their places: by his allowance, in the same sort as others were to allow of him, as much as in him lay he was content to confirm and make good his ordination, though somewhat irregular and defective; which no way proveth that the confirming of

confirmatum in episcopatu."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 18. [Tom. I. p. 326.]

¹ “Ἡ κατὰ σύμβασιν τοίνυν Μαξίμου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ἀντιοχείων καὶ Ἰουβενάλιου τοῦ ὀσιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν γενομένη συναίνεσις ἣν ἡ ἑκατέρου κατάθεσις ἐδήλωσε, βεβαία καὶ ἐξ ἡμετέρας ἀποφάσεως, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ψήφου τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον διαμένει. κ.τ.λ.”—Conc. Chalced. Action. vii. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 618.]

² “Satis sit quod vestrae pietatis auxilio, et mei favoris assensu episcopatum tantæ urbis obtinuit.”—Leo, Epist. liv. Ad Marcianum. [Al. Epist. civ. Tom. I. col. 1149.]

the great bishops of the world pertained any otherwise to the bishop of Rome, than the right of confirming him pertained unto them. Yet this is in effect all they can say: for that Leo¹ willeth the bishop of Thessalonica to take knowledge of the metropolitans chosen in the provinces subject to him, as vicegerent to the patriarch of Rome, and by his assent to confirm their ordination; as likewise, that writing to the bishops of Africa, subject to him as patriarch, he telleth them², he is content the bishop of Salicen turned from Novatianism, shall keep his place, if he send unto him the confession of his faith, and that Gregory³ complaineth, that the bishop of Salona within his patriarchship was ordained without his privity and consent, doth no more prove the pope to be universal bishop, than the other patriarchs, without whose assent none of the metropolitans subject to them might be ordained. And this was it that so much grieved Gregory, namely, that his bishops (thereby putting a difference between such as were subject to him, in that he was patriarch of the West, and others) should so despise and contemn him. But let our adversaries prove, that either Gregory, or any of his predecessors, ever challenged the confirmation of metropolitans, subject to any of the other patriarchs, and we will confess they say something: otherwise all that they bring is idle, and to no purpose, proving nothing that we ever doubted of. For we know the bishop of Rome had the right of confirming the metropolitans within the precincts of his own patriarchship,

¹ "De persona consecrandi episcopi, et de cleri plebisque consensu metropolitanus episcopus ad fraternitatem tuam referat; quodque in provincia bene placuit scire te faciat: ut ordinationem rite celebrandam tua quoque firmet auctoritas...."

"Sicut enim justas electiones nullis dilationibus volumus fatigari ita nihil permittimus te ignorante præsumi."—Id. Epist. lxxxiv. Ad Anast. Thessal. [Al. Epist. xiv. col. 688.]

² "Donatum Salicensem ex Novatianis, cum sua, ut comperimus plebe conversum ita dominico gregi volumus præsidere, ut libellum fidei suæ ad nos meminerit dirigendum, quo et Novatiani dogmatis damnet errorem, et plenissime confiteatur catholicam veritatem."—Id. Epist. lxxxvii. Ad Episc. Afric. [Al. Epist. xii. col. 665.]

³ "Salonitanæ civitatis episcopus, me ac responsali meo nesciente, ordinatus est, et facta res est quæ sub nullis anterioribus principibus evenit."—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxiv. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xxi. Tom. ii. col. 752. Par. 1705.]

as likewise every other patriarch had : and that therefore he might send the pall to sundry parts of Greece, France, and Spain, as Bellarmine allegeth, being all within the compass of his patriarchship, and yet not be universal bishop, as Bellarmine¹ would willingly from hence infer.

Wherefore seeing our adversaries have so little to say for the pope's right of confirming bishops, let us proceed to see what proofs they can produce of his power and authority in deposing them. Their first allegation² is touching Stephen bishop of Rome, deposing, as they suppose, Martianus bishop of Arle in France, who had joined himself with Novatianus, denying reconciliation, and the Church's peace, to such as having fallen and denied the faith, afterwards repented and turned again unto God. This allegation is too weak to prove their intended conclusion. For it is most certain by all circumstances of the Epistle of Cyprian cited by Bellarmine, that Stephen the bishop of Rome did not depose Martianus by himself alone : and therefore Cyprian doth not say to Stephen, Therefore hath God appointed thee to be over all bishops, that if they fall into heresy, or fail in the performance of their duty, thou mightest set all right again : but, "Therefore hath God appointed a great number of bishops, that if any one of that company and society fall into heresy, and begin to tear, rend, and waste the flock of Christ, the rest may help, and, as good and pitiful pastors, gather the scattered sheep of Christ into the fold again." Neither doth

¹ "Passim in epistolis suis indicat [Gregorius] se mittere pallium quod est archiepiscopatus insigne ad varios archiepiscopos Græciæ, Galliæ, Hispaniæ, &c. Notandum autem est quod etsi ex confirmatione episcoporum probatur primatus Romani pontificis, tamen non est necesse ut omnes episcopos semper confirmaverit. Potuit enim id permittere patriarchis et primatibus, ut in multis locis factum videtur."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelatæ consistentem a te litteræ, quibus absente Marciano alius in locum ejus substituat.

"Idcirco enim, frater carissime, copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordie mutue glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresin facere et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri, et quasi pastores utiles et misericordes oves dominicas in gregem colligant."—Cyprian. Lib. III. Epist. xiii. [Al. Epist. lxxviii. pp. 177, 8.]

he say to Stephen, that he should suspend Martianus, but "that he should write to the bishops of France to do it," and not to suffer him any longer to insult upon the company of catholic bishops, for that he was not yet suspended, and rejected from their communion. But some man perhaps will ask why Cyprian desireth Stephen to write to the bishops of France, and writeth not himself, as if the power of deposing Martianus were no more in Stephen than in himself. Surely there may be three reasons given of his so doing: the first, because he was nearer to them than Cyprian; the second, because he, as patriarch of the West, with his bishops, was more likely to prevail than Cyprian with his Africans alone; the third, for that (as Cyprian¹ himself observeth in the end of this epistle) it more concerned him than any other to maintain the reputation of Lucius and Cornelius his predecessors, and to oppose himself against Martianus, who joined himself with Novatianus, that had schismatically and heretically rent and divided himself from them, and made a schism in their Church. Neither doth that which followeth (where he desireth Stephen to write unto him, who is appointed in the room of Martianus, that so he may know whom to write unto, and with whom to communicate) import, that he should by himself alone constitute the bishop of Arle; but that writing to the people to choose, and the bishops of the province to direct them in choosing, and to consecrate him they should choose, he should require to be certified from them of their proceedings accordingly, that so he might impart the same unto him.

The next proof that the pope hath authority to depose any bishop of the world, deserving to be deposed, is out of the epistle of Nicholas the First² to Michael the emperor of

¹ "Servandus est enim antecessorum nostrorum beatorum martyrum Cornelii et Lucii honor gloriosus, quorum memoriam cum nos honoremus, multo magis tu, frater carissime, honorificare et servare gravitate et auctoritate tua debes, qui vicarius et successor eorum factus es."—[Ibid.]

² "Nicolaus I. in epist. ad Michaelem enumerat octo patriarchas Constantinopolitanos quos Romani pontifices deposuerunt, inter quos unus fuit Anthimus quem Agapetus papa deposuit, non obstantibus minis Augusti et Augustæ, et loco ejus ipse suis manibus Constantinopoli Mennam ordinavit, ut Liberatus scribit in Breviario, cap. 21, et Zonaras in vita Justiniani."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

Constantinople. But whosoever shall peruse the place, shall find, that no such thing can be concluded out of it. For the drift of Nicholas in that epistle, is to show, that the inferiors may not judge their superiors, as the provincial bishops their metropolitans, or the metropolitans their patriarch; but that still the greater must judge the lesser. "If a clerk," saith the council of Chalcedon¹, "have ought against his bishop, let the matter be heard in the synod of the province: but if a bishop or clerk have a complaint against the metropolitan, let him go to the primate of the diocese, or to the see of Constantinople: so that ever the greater must judge the lesser, and the lesser may never presume to judge the greater, so long as there is any greater to fly unto." And therefore John of Antioch in the council of Ephesus was reprov'd, for that being but bishop of the third see, he presumed to judge Cyril, bishop of the second see; and Dioscorus, bishop of the second see, was condemn'd in the council of Chalcedon, for that he judg'd Leo, bishop of the first see. This he insisteth upon, to show, that the bishops subject to Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, had unjustly proceeded against him; and then to show, that this their proceeding was strange and new, he saith, "there hath scarce been any of the bishops of Constantinople deposed, whose deposition hath been holden just and good, without the concurrence of the see of Rome." Now how will this prove that the pope hath power in himself alone to depose all bishops worthy to be deposed? Is it consequent, that if the bishops of patriarchal sees may not be judged by their own bishops alone, nor by those that are in degree of honour inferior to them, and that the patriarchs of higher sees, with their bishops, must concur with the bishops of those patriarchs that are judged, and that never any bishop of Constantinople, being next in honour to the bishop of Rome, was deposed but by such a synod, whereof the bishop of Rome was president, that the bishop of Rome hath in himself alone the fulness of all ecclesiastical power? Surely, I think

¹ "Εἰ δὲ καὶ κληρικὸς ἔχοι πρᾶγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω. Εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίῃ, καταλαμβάνετω ἢ τὸν ἑξάρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω."—Concil. Chalced. Can. 9 [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1685.]

not, our adversaries themselves being judges. But Gelasius¹ in his epistle to the bishops of Dardania, saith, “the see apostolic by her authority condemned Dioscorus, bishop of the second see:” therefore the pope hath all ecclesiastical power originally seated in himself alone. Truly this consequence is no better than the former. For by the see apostolic Gelasius understandeth the Roman bishop, and the bishops of the West subject to him, who synodically condemned Dioscorus, and yet not without the concurrence of many other bishops: nor so as that the judgment was thought perfect, till an œcumenical synod² confirmed it, as it appeareth by the course of histories.

The next example is the deposition of Flavianus bishop of Antioch, by Damasus bishop of Rome³. But this example might have been spared: for it is most certain that Damasus did not depose Flavianus. The circumstances of the history are these: Eustathius, that worthy bishop of Antioch, who made that excellent oration in the praise of Constantine in the council of Nice⁴, and was so earnest and zealous a defender of the true faith against the Arians, being by certain Arians⁵ cast out of his bishopric, and banished, upon the occasion of a lewd woman charging him to have committed adultery with her, but afterward confessing she had wronged him, and that she had been suborned by those Arians so to accuse him, Eulalius was chosen into his place, whom Euphronius succeeded, and after him Placitus obtained the bishopric. All these did secretly favour Arianism, and therefore many, both of the people and priests, forsaking the public assemblies, had their private meetings, and were called Eustathians; for that, after the banishment of Eustathius, they began thus to assemble together. Stephen⁶ succeeded Placitus, Leontius Stephen, and Eudoxius⁷

¹ “Item Gelasius in epistola ad episcopos Dardaniæ: ‘Dioscorus,’ inquit, ‘secundæ sedis præsulem sua auctoritate sedes apostolica damnavit.’ Et ibidem, ‘B. Petri sedes Alexandrinum Petrum, quem se tantummodo damnassee non etiam solvisse noverat, non recipit.’—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² Vide Acta Concil. Chalced. [Act. iii. Apud Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 372, sqq.]

³ “Præterea Flavianum patriarcham Antiochenum deposuit Damasus.”—Bellarm. [ibid.] ex Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. cap. 23.

⁴ Theodoret. H. E. Lib. i. cap. 7.

⁵ Ibid. cap. 21, 22.

⁶ Idem. Lib. ii. cap. 24.

⁷ Ibid. cap. 25.

Leontius; who obtaining to be bishop of Constantinople¹, left the Church of Antioch void; whereupon the bishops of the province assembled together, and chose Milesius to be bishop, some of them hoping that he would favour Arianism, and other knowing that he was an orthodox; the error of the one side mis-persuaded of the man, and the true knowledge the other had of him, made both willingly to consent to his election and ordination. But so soon as the Arians perceived what he was, they deposed him, and sent him into banishment, placing Euzoius in his place: which when the people and priests that were catholic perceived, who had long endured the insolencies of the Arians, they divided themselves, and refused to communicate with him. After a while Milesius², in the time of Julian, returneth from banishment; to whom though such catholics as divided themselves upon dislike of Euzoius, presently cleaved; yet would not they that first divided themselves in respect of Eustathius, neither at the first ordination of Milesius, though Eustathius were then dead, nor now upon his return, by any means be induced to hold communion with him and his: which Lucifer, one of them that had been in banishment with Athanasius, seeing and pitying, laboured with them what he could to bring them to unity. But when he saw they would not be induced to join with Milesius, and that Paulinus was their leader, he made him their bishop: which act of his made the schism more dangerous than before, and of longer continuance than otherwise happily it would have been; for it continued eighty-five years³. Milesius⁴ perceiving Paulinus to be ordained bishop over them that were divided from his communion, seemed no whit therewith to be offended or displeased, but spake peaceably to Paulinus, desiring him that they might join their flocks, and feed them together: "and if," said he, "the throne divide us, let me lay the gospel in it, and then do thou sit in it sometimes, and I will sit in it at other times; and if I die before thee, thou shalt have the care and charge of all: if thou die before me, the care and charge of all shall be devolved to me." This council Paulinus would not hearken unto, and therefore the emperor's officers adjudged the Churches to Milesius, and the guiding of the divided sheep to Paulinus: whereupon, when Milesius died, though Paulinus would have

¹ Cap. 31. ² Lib. III. cap. 4. ³ Ibid. cap. 5. ⁴ Lib. v. cap. 3.

had the place¹, yet he was refused, because he had refused to hearken to the counsel of Milesius; and the bishops chose Flavianus, a man very conspicuous for his great labours, and one that had exposed himself to many dangers for the good of the Church. Yet this ordination greatly displeased the Egyptians and Romans. The reason of which their so great dislike², was for that when there was much contention between Milesius and Paulinus, it was so agreed, that all they that were fit for that bishopric, or might in likelihood be in any hope or expectation of it, should swear neither to seek it nor accept it, while either of these lived; nor no way to hinder, but that after the death of the one, the other might have the full and entire government of the whole; of which number it was thought that Flavianus was one, and that therefore not without perjury, contrary to his vow and oath, he had hindered the reuniting of the divided parts of the Church. This dislike conceived against Flavianus died not when Paulinus died³; but though Evagrius most unlawfully and against the canons had gotten the bishopric, having no ordination but from his predecessor, (whereas the canons allow no such nomination of a successor, and besides require the presence of the bishops of the province,) yet would they that at first disliked the ordination of Flavianus take no knowledge of any of these things, but communicated with Evagrius, and incited the emperor against Flavianus; who, being urged continually by the bishop of Rome, and others, no longer to suffer Flavianus to enjoy his place, and told, that suppressing tyrants he did ill to suffer the violaters of the laws of the Church to escape unpunished; sent for Flavianus, thinking to send him to Rome, there to be judged in a synod of bishops: who when he came into the presence of the emperor, told him confidently, that if any man would object against his doctrine or life, he would desire to be tried by no other judges but his greatest enemies; but if the matter were for his episcopal chair, he would willingly relinquish it, that the emperor might commit it to whom he would: upon which his confident answer, the emperor dismissed him, and bade him to go home, and feed the flock

¹ Ibid. cap. 23.

² Sozomen. Lib. vii. cap. 3. & 11. Socrates, Lib. v. cap. 15.

³ Theodoret. Lib. v. cap. 23.

committed to him. Yet long after, many complaints were again renewed against him to the emperor by sundry bishops being at Rome, fearing to tax the emperor himself for that he suppressed not the tyranny of Flavianus; but the emperor bade them say what that tyranny was, as if he were Flavianus, for that he had undertaken the defence of him. Which when they refused to do, professing themselves unwilling to stand upon terms with the emperor, he exhorted them to lay aside their foolish quarrellings, and to reunite the Churches that had long without cause been divided: for that Paulinus was now dead, and Evagrius came unjustly to the bishopric; and the ordination of Flavianus was so far forth allowed of, that all the Churches of the East, with the Churches of Asia, Pontus, Thracia, and Illyricum, held Flavianus to be lawful bishop of the East. Hereupon the bishops promised to surcease, and that if Flavianus would send legates unto them, they would kindly entreat them, and hold communion with him. Howsoever it appeareth by Socrates¹, that after the death of Evagrius he procured there should be no bishops chosen in opposition to him; and first pacified Theophilus, and afterwards by his means Damasus. Sozomen² reporteth, that Chrysostom, after he was made bishop of Constantinople, finding that the Egyptian and western bishops dissented from those of the East, in respect of Flavianus, and that all the Churches throughout the whole empire were divided about him, besought Theophilus to be pacified towards him, and to assist him for the reconciling of Damasus also. To this suit of Chrysostom Theophilus yielded, and sent certain to Rome; who prevailing, sailed into Egypt, and from thence, as also from Rome, brought letters of reconciliation and peace, both from the Egyptian and Western bishops. This history, I think, will never prove that the bishop of Rome deposed Flavianus, bishop of Antioch, and that he could not hold his bishopric till the bishop of Rome consented to him. For the thing that was sought was not his holding of his bishopric, as Bellarmine untruly reporteth, but the peace and concord of the Churches, divided about him. Neither was the difference only between him and Damasus, but all the bishops of Egypt and the West dissented from him likewise: and therefore Ambrose sheweth, that the examining of the matter between Evagrius and him,

¹ Socrat. H. E. v. 5.² Sozomen. H. E. III. 3.

was committed to Theophilus and the bishops of Egypt¹, and desireth him to make relation of the end he should make to the bishop of Rome, that he also agreeing thereunto, an universal peace might be concluded. So that nothing can be concluded out of this history for proof of the universal power of popes: seeing Damasus could neither of himself alone, nor with the concurrence of the western bishops, depose Flavianus, nor by any means persuade the emperor to thrust him out of his place; but was sharply reprov'd by the emperor for quarrelling with him, and required to be at peace with him, that so the Churches formerly divided without cause might be reunited.

The next instance of the pope's deposing bishops is that of Sixtus the Third², who deposed Polychronius bishop of Jerusalem, if we may believe Bellarmine. But in truth there was never any such thing. The circumstances of the whole proceeding against Polychronius, bishop of Jerusalem, (if there be any credit in the report of pope Nicholas³, and the acts of the council under Sixtus the Third) were these. Two things specially were objected to him: the one, that he went about to violate the ancient bounds of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of bishops, set and limited by the fathers, to prefer himself before the other principal bishops, and to make his see the first, whereas in truth it was the last amongst the patriarchal sees; the other, that simoniacally he conferred ecclesiastical honours upon such as would purchase the same. Hereupon the bishops subject to him, not willing to proceed against him themselves alone, complained to the bishop of Rome, and showed him how much he was wronged by the undue claims of this bishop. The bishop of Rome took not upon him to do anything of himself, but called a synod of the bishops of the

¹ "Sane referendum arbitramur ad sanctum fratrem nostrum Romanæ sacerdotem ecclesiæ; quoniam præsumimus ea te judicaturum quæ etiam illi displicere nequeant. Ita enim utile erit consultum sententiæ, ita pacis et quietis securitas."—Ambros. Epist. lxxviii. [Al. Epist. lvi. Tom. ii. col. 1007. Par. 1690.]

² "Episcopum etiam Hierosolymitanum Polychronium deposuit Sixtus III. misso ad hoc in Hierusalem S. Leone archidiacono, qui postea fuit papa, ut patet ex Tom. i. Consilior. in Act. Sixti III. [Vid. Acta Sixti III. Apud Labbe, Concil. Tom. iv. col. 515, sqq.]

³ Vid. Epist. Nicolai papæ ad Michael, Imp. [Epist. viii. Labbe, Tom. ix. col. 1325.]

West, and by their advice, with the concurrence of the emperor, directed certain out of the West, authorized by the whole synod, to go and sit in council with the bishops of those parts: who together with them examining the crimes objected to Polychronius, and finding that he was truly charged with them, deposed him from his bishopric; so that the bishop of Rome did not depose him of himself, but only called a synod, (as in such a case it was fit he should) and the synod deposed him; but in truth it is rather to be thought that the acts of the council under Sixtus the Third are counterfeit, and of no credit. For Binius¹ sheweth that there was no such Polychronius bishop of Jerusalem in those times, and bringeth many other reasons to disprove the acts of this supposed council, besides that the absurdity in the proceedings bewrayeth them to be counterfeit. For what can be more absurd, than that the accuser of Polychronius, making good his accusation, should be condemned for accusing him, and he first condemned; and then presently, upon slender or no reasons at all, restored again?

Thus we see how little our adversaries are able to say for proof of the pope's universal power, exercised in deposing bishops. Wherefore let us now proceed to see if they can produce any better proofs of his restoring such as were deposed by others. The first example they bring, is the restitution of Basilides², a bishop in Spain; but they know right well that the bishop of Rome did not restore him to his bishopric, and that therefore this allegation serveth to no purpose but to abuse the reader, and to make him believe they say something,

¹ "Temporibus Sixti vel Leonis pontificum ab anno Domini 429, usque ad annum Christi 457 non modo non aliquis Polychronius Hierosolymitanæ sedis episcopum egit, sed neque apud Nicephorum episcopum Constantinopolitanum, qui texuit catalogum episcoporum Hierosolymitanorum, neque apud Callistum vel Evagrium qui horum res in orientali ecclesia gestas prosecuti sunt, usquam vel levis saltem Polychronii nominis mentio habetur."—Binius in annot. ad Concil. Roman. sub Sixto III. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 524.]

² "Nec rescindere ordinationem jure perfectam potest, quod Basilides post crimina sua detecta et conscientiam etiam propria confessione nudatam Romam pergens Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum et gestæ rei ac tacitæ veritatis ignarum fefellit, ut exambiret reponi se injuste in episcopatum, de quo fuerat juste depositus."—Cyprian. Lib. i. Epist. iv. [Al. Epist. lxxvii. p. 173.]

when they say nothing. The circumstances of the matter concerning Basilides, are these, laid down in Cyprian's epistles. Basilides and Martialis had defiled themselves with some kind of consenting to idolatry, and therefore the clergy and people subject to them, fearful to communicate with them, write to Cyprian and the African bishops, for counsel and help: they return answer, that they are to withdraw themselves from them, and to proceed to the election of new bishops. Hereupon the bishops of the province coming to the place where Basilides was bishop, Sabinus was elected bishop by the clergy and people, with the liking of all the bishops of the province, and ordained by them bishop in the place of Basilides. After this Basilides goeth to Rome, mis-informeth Stephen the bishop, and seeketh by his means, and the help of his bishops, to recover his place again. They communicate with him, and do, as much as in them lieth, restore him to his former place and dignity again. Cyprian condemneth the false and ill dealing of Basilides, and reproveth also the negligence of Stephen, that suffered himself so easily to be misled, taxing him and such as consented with him for communicating with such wicked ones, and showing that they are partakers of their sins, and that they violate the canon of the Church, which the bishops of Africa, and all the bishops of the world, yea even Cornelius the predecessor of this Stephen, had consented on: to wit, that men so defiled with idolatry as Martialis and Basilides were should be received to penitency, but be kept from all ecclesiastical honour. Hereupon he exhorteth the brethren not to be moved, if in these last times the faith of some men be shaken, or the fear of God fail in them, or if they hold not peaceable concord with their brethren: for that both the apostle and the Lord himself foretold that such things should come to pass in the last times, the world decaying, and antichrist's revelation drawing on: and comforteth and encourageth them to hold on in the good course they were in, for that the vigour of the gospel, and the strength of Christian virtue and faith, do not so wholly fall away in these last times, *ut non supersit portio sacerdotum, que minime ad has rerum ruinas et fidei naufragia succumbat*: that is, "that no remnant of bishops should remain which should no way sink or fall in these overthrows of things, and shipwrecks of faith, but full of the fear of God, courageously maintain the honour

of the Divine Majesty, and the dignity of the priests." "We know," saith he¹, "that when the rest yielded, Mattathias valiantly maintained the law of God; and that Elias stood and strove zealously, when others forsook the law of his God. Wherefore let them that either violate the canons, or treacherously behave themselves, look to it: there are many who still retain a sincere and good mind. What if some have fallen away from the faith? doth their infidelity make the truth of God of none effect? God forbid. For God is true, and every man a liar; and if every man be a liar, and God only true, what should the servants and priests of God do, but leave the errors and lies of men, and keep the precepts of the Lord, and remain in the truth of God? Wherefore, though some of our brethren and colleagues think they may neglect the discipline of God, and rashly communicate with Basilides and Martialis; let it not trouble nor shake our faith, seeing the Spirit of God threateneth in the Psalms, saying, 'Thou hast hated discipline, and cast my words behind thy back. If thou sawest a thief,

¹ "Meminimus et tenemus, succumbentibus licet et cedentibus cæteris, Mattathiam legem Dei vindicasse fortiter: Heliam Judæis deficientibus atque a religione Divina recedentibus stetisse et certasse sublimiter: Daniele nec solitudine religionis alienæ, nec persecutionis assiduæ infestatione deterritum frequenter ac fortiter gloriosa edidisse martyria: tres item pueros nec annis nec minis fractos, contra ignes Babylonios fideliter obstitisse, et victorem regem in ipsa captivitate vicisse. Viderit vel prævaricatorum numerus vel proditorum qui nunc in ecclesia contra ecclesiam surgere et fidem pariter ac veritatem laquefactare cœperunt. Permanet apud plurimos sincera mens et religio integra, et non nisi Domino et Deo suo anima devota, nec Christianam fidem aliena perfidia deprimit ad ruinam, sed magis excitat et exaltat ad gloriam, secundum quod beatus apostolus Paulus hortatur, et dicit. [Rom. iii. 3.] 'Quid enim si exciderunt a fide quidam eorum? nunquid infidelitas eorum fidem Dei evacuavit? Absit. Est enim Deus verax, omnis autem homo mendax.' Si autem omnis homo mendax est, et solus Deus verax, quid aliud servi et maxime sacerdotes Dei facere debemus, nisi ut humanos errores et mendacia relinquamus, et præcepta dominica custodientes in Dei veritate maneamus? Quare etsi aliqui de collegis nostris extiterunt, fratres dilectissimi, qui deificam disciplinam negligendam putant, et cum Basilide et Martiali temere communicant, conturbare fidem nostram res ista non debet, cum Spiritus Sanctus in Psalmis talibus comminetur, dicens, 'Tu autem odisti disciplinam, et abjecisti sermones meos retro: si videbas furem concurrebas ei, et cum adulteris portionem tuam ponebas.'"—[Cyprian. Ibid. p. 174.]

thou rannest with him, and hadst thy portion with the adulterers.' ” These are the circumstances of Cyprian's epistle, wherein he relateth the proceedings against Basilides and Martialis, and the inconsiderate course held by the bishop of Rome, hastily communicating with them: whereby we may see how wisely and advisedly our adversaries allege Cyprian to prove, that in ancient times the bishops of Rome had power to restore such bishops to their places again as were deposed by other. For thus they must reason from this place of Cyprian, if they will make any use of it: Basilides and Martialis justly put from their office and dignity, and others rightly and in due sort chosen into their places, fly to Stephen, bishop of Rome, hoping by his means to procure the reversing of that which was done against them. He, with such as adhered to him, though they could not restore them to their places, yet communicated with them. Cyprian offended herewith, chargeth Basilides and Martialis with execrable wickedness, for abusing Stephen, and misinforming him; and Stephen with intolerable negligence and unexcusable violation of the canons, for partaking with such wicked persons; and wisheth all his brethren and colleagues constantly to hold on their course against them, notwithstanding the failing of Stephen and his adherents. Therefore the ancient bishops of Rome restored to their places such as were judicially deposed by others, and were thought by the fathers to have power and authority so to do. Which kind of reasoning, I think, the reader will not much like of.

Touching Athanasius¹ bishop of Alexandria, Paul bishop of Constantinople, and Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, deposed by the oriental synod, their complaints to the bishop of Rome, and other bishops of the West, of the wrongs done unto them; how the bishop of Rome with the western bishops sought to relieve them, with how ill success, and how little this instance serveth to prove the thing in question, I have showed before²; as likewise Theodoret's desiring Leo, with his western synods, to take knowledge of his cause. So that it is a vain brag of Bellarmine, that to these, and the like testimonies of antiquity, nothing is, nor can be answered.

¹ “Deinde Athanasium Alexandrinum, Paulum Constantinopolitanum, et Marcellum Ancyranum episcopos a synodo orientali depositos Julius I. restituit.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² Supra, cap. 35, [p. 314, 5.]

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

OF THE WEAKNESS OF SUCH PROOFS OF THE SUPREME POWER OF POPES, AS ARE TAKEN FROM THEIR LAWS, CENSURES, DISPENSATIONS, AND THE VICEGERENTS THEY HAD IN PLACES FAR REMOTE FROM THEM.

HAVING examined the pretended proofs of the illimited universality of the pope's authority and jurisdiction, taken from the power they are supposed to have exercised in former times over other bishops, by confirming, deposing, or restoring them; let us come to their laws, dispensations, and censures, and see if from thence anything may be concluded. If they could as strongly prove, as they confidently undertake, that popes in ancient times made laws to bind the whole Christian Church, dispensed with such as were made by general councils, and censured all men as subject to them of necessity, we must be forced to acknowledge the fulness of all power to rest in the Roman bishops. But their proofs are too weak to make us believe any such thing. For first, touching the decrees of popes, they did not bind the whole Christian Church, but the western provinces only that were subject to them as patriarchs of the West. And secondly, they were not made by them without the consent and joint concurrence of the other bishops of the West, assembled in synods, and sitting with them as their fellow-judges, with equal power of defining and determining things concerning the state of the Church: as appeareth by the decrees of Gregory the First¹, who sitting in council with all the bishops of the Roman Church, (the deacons and inferior clergymen standing before them) made decrees, and confirmed them by their subscriptions, the rest of the bishops and the presbyters also who sat in council with them subscribing in the very same sort that Gregory did. And of decrees in such sort made, Leo speaketh², when he requireth

¹ "Gregorius papa coram sanctissimo beati Petri corpore cum episcopis omnibus ac Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyteris residens, adstantibus diaconibus et cuncto clero, dixit, &c."—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. lxxxviii. [Al. xlv. Append. Tom. ii. col. 1288. Par. 1705.]

² "Hoc itaque admonitio nostra denuntiat quod si quis fratrum contra hæc constituta venire tentaverit, et prohibita fuerit ausus admittere, a suo se noverit officio submovendum, nec communionis nostræ futurum esse consortem qui socius esse noluit disciplinæ. Ne quid

the bishops of Campania, Picene, and Thuscia, to keep and observe the decretal constitutions of Innocentius, and all other his predecessors, which they had ordained as well touching ecclesiastical orders, as the discipline of the canons, or otherwise to look for no favour or pardon. And in the very same sort are the words of Hilarius¹ to be understood, when he saith, "That no man may violate either the divine constitutions, or the decrees of the apostolic see, without danger of losing his place." For this he spake sitting as president in a council of bishops assembled at Rome, of things decreed by synods of bishops, wherein his predecessors were presidents and moderators, as he was now, but not absolute commanders. But Bellarmine² saith, that "pope Anastasius the younger, in his Epistle to Anastasius the emperor, willeth him not to resist the apostolical precepts, but obediently to perform what by the Church of Rome and apostolical authority shall be prescribed unto him, if he desire to hold communion with the same holy Church of God, which is his head. Therefore the pope had power to command and give laws to the emperor, and consequently had an absolute supreme authority in the Church." Surely this allegation of the cardinal is like the rest. For Anastasius doth not speak in any such peremptory and threatening manner to the emperor, but acknowledging his breast to be a sanctuary of happiness, and that he is God's vicar on earth, telleth him in modest and humble sort, that he hopeth he will not suffer the insolency of those of Constantinople proudly to resist against the evangelical and apostolical precepts in the cause of Acatius, but that he will force them to perform

vero sit quod prætermisum a nobis forte credatur, omnia decretalia constituta tam beatæ recordationis Innocentii quam omnium decessorum nostrorum quæ de ecclesiasticis ordinibus et canonum promulgata sunt disciplinis, ita a vestra dilectione custodiri debere mandamus ut si quis in illa commiserit veniam sibi deinceps noverit denegari."—Leo. Epist. i. [Al. Epist. iv. Tom. i. col. 616.]

¹ "Nulli fas sit sine status sui periculo vel divinas constitutiones vel apostolicæ sedis decreta temerare."—Hilarius, citat. a Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. ii. Cap. 19. [Tom. i. p. 329.]

² "Anastasius junior papa in epist. ad Anastas. Aug. 'Præceptis,' inquit, 'apostolicis non dura superbia resistatur, sed per obedientiam quæ a S. Romana ecclesia et apostolica auctoritate jussa sunt salubriter impleantur, si ejusdem sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ quæ est caput vestrum communionem habere desideratis.'"—Bellarm. [Ibid.]

and do what is fit, and in like humble sort beseecheth him, when he shall understand the cause of them of Alexandria, to force them to return to the unity of the Church. The last instance of the pope's lawgiving power, brought by Bellarmine, is the privilege granted to the monastery of St Medardus, by Gregory the First¹; in the end whereof we find these words: "Whatsoever kings, bishops, judges, or secular persons, shall violate the decrees of this apostolical authority, and our commandment, shall be deprived of their honour, driven from the society of Christians, put from the communion of the Lord's body and blood, and subjected to anathema, and all the woful curses that infidels and heretics have been subject to from the beginning of the world to this present time." A strong confirmation of the privileges granted is found in these words, but a weak confirmation of the thing in question: for the privileges were granted and confirmed in this sort, not by Gregory alone out of the fulness of his power, but by the consenting voice of all the bishops of Italy and France, by the authority of the senate of Rome, by Theodoricus the king, and Brunichildis the queen. So that from hence no proof possibly can be drawn of the pope's absolute power of making laws by himself alone, to bind any part of the Christian Church, much less the whole Christian world.

Wherefore let us pass from the pope's power of making laws, to see by what right they claim authority to dispense with the laws of the Church, and the canons of general councils. The first that is alleged to have dispensed with the canons of councils is Gelasius². But this allegation is idle,

¹ "Si quis regum antistitum judicum vel quarumcumque secularium personarum hujus apostolicæ auctoritatis et nostræ præceptionis decreta violaverit, aut contradixerit, aut negligenter duxerit, vel fratres inquietaverit, vel conturbaverit, vel aliter ordinaverit, cujuscumque dignitatis vel sublimitatis sit honore suo privetur, et ut catholicæ fidei depravator, vel sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ destructor, a consortio Christianitatis, et corpore ac sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi sequestretur, et omnium maledictionum anathemate quibus infideles et hæretici ab initio seculi usque in præsens damnati sunt, cum Juda traditore domini, in inferno inferiori damnetur, nisi digna poenitentia præfatorum sanctorum sibi propitiaverit clementiam et fratrum communem reconciliaverit concordiam."—Greg. Ad finem epist. [Tom. II. Append. col. 1287.]

² "De dispensationibus exemplum habemus in epist. i. Gelasii, (nam recentiora infinita de industria prætermittimus), 'Necessaria,'

and to no purpose. For first, it cannot be proved, that by dispensing he sought to free any from the necessity of doing that the strictness of the canon required, but those only that were subject to him as patriarch of the West. And secondly, he did not dispense but upon very urgent cause, and driven by necessity so to do; and yet not of himself alone, but with the concurrence of other bishops of the West, assembled in synod. The other instances that are brought of the dispensations of Gregory the First¹ are nothing else but the instances of the ill consciences of them that bring them. For Gregory did not dispense with the English to marry within the degrees prohibited, (as the cardinal untruly reporteth) but only advised Austin² not to put them that were newly converted from such wives as they had married within some of the degrees prohibited, in the time of their infidelity, lest he might seem to punish them for faults committed in the days of their ignorance, and to discourage other from becoming Christians. Neither did he dispense with them of Sicilia for the not keeping of the canon of the Nicene council, requiring provincial synods to be holden twice every year³; but whereas they held

inquit, '*rerum dispositione jungimur, et apostolicæ sedis moderamine convenimur, sic canonum paternorum decreta librare et retro præsulorum decessorumque nostrorum præcepta metiri, ut quæ præsentiam necessitas temporum restaurandis ecclesiis relaxanda deprecatur, adhibita consideratione diligenti quantum potest fieri, temperemus,*' et ibidem in multis dispensat.—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

¹ "Item Gregorius, Lib. XII. Epist. xxxi. Felici episcopo Siciliæ dicit, se dispensasse cum Anglis circa matrimonia in gradibus prohibitis; et rursum cum Siculis, ut semel tantum in anno concilium celebrent; cum alioquin regulæ præcipiant bis in anno concilia celebrari. Porro regula ista in qua Gregorius dispensabat, est can. 5. Concil. i. Generalis."—Bellarm. [Ibid.]

² "Quia multi sunt in Anglorum gente qui dum adhuc in infidelitate essent huic nefando conjugio dicuntur admixti, ad fidem venientes admonendi sunt ut se abstineant, et grave hoc peccatum esse cognoscant. . . . Non tamen pro hac re corporis ac sanguinis Domini communionem privandi sunt, ne in eis illa ulcisci videamur in quibus se per ignorantiam ante lavacrum baptismatis adstrinxerunt."—Greg. Lib. XII. Epist. xxxi. [Al. Lib. XI. Epist. lxiv. Tom. II. col. 1155.]

³ "Illud quoque fieri debere perspeximus ut semel per annum ad Syracusanam sive Catanensium civitatem universaliter honore quo dignum est, sicut eidem jussimus, fraternitas vestra conveniat."—[Lib. I. Epist. i. col. 486.]

not such councils so much as once in the year, he commanded that they should not fail to meet in council once at the least every year, seeing the canons require that these meetings should be twice. These truly are very weak and insufficient proofs of the papal power in dispensing with the laws of the Church, and the canons of general councils: and yet these are the best, nay, these are all that they can make show to bring out of all antiquity.

Let us therefore proceed to the censures that the ancient bishops of Rome are reported to have exercised, and see if they prove the universality of power now claimed. The first allegation to this purpose, is the intent of Victor, bishop of Rome¹, resolving to have rejected from his communion all the churches of Asia, for keeping the feast of Easter on the same day the Jews did. "For," saith Bellarmine², "howsoever Irenæus and others dissuaded him from executing that he intended, yet it appeareth his observation was right, in that it was afterwards confirmed by the Nicene council, and that he had authority over all, in that he went about to excommunicate those of Asia for dissenting from him in the observation of that feast, and keeping it with the Jews, though he were content, for the avoiding of some inconveniences, at the intreaty of Irenæus, to forbear proceeding against them." For answer hereunto we must observe, that by reason of the custom of those of Asia, that kept the feast of Easter precisely at the same time the Jews did, there was moved not a little contention throughout the whole world, and many synods in every place called. For in Palestine³ a synod was

¹ "Ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ μὲν τῆς Ῥωμαίων προεστὼς Βίκτωρ ἀθρόως τῆς Ἀσίας πάσης ἅμα ταῖς ὁμόροις ἐκκλησίαις τὰς παροικίας ἀποτέμνειν, ὡς ἑτεροδοξούσας, τῆς κοινῆς ἐνώσεως πειράται, καὶ στηλιτεύει γε διὰ γραμμάτων ἀκοινωνήτους πάντας ἄρδην τοὺς ἐκείσε ἀνακηρύττων ἀδελφούς."—Euseb. H. E. v. 24.

² "Respondeo quod Irenæus et multi alii Victorem objurgaverint quod tantas ecclesias levi de causa, ut ipsis videbatur, a corporis ecclesiastici unitate præcidisset, testatur Eusebius ibidem; at quod Victor sententiam suam mutaverit nusquam legimus.... Est autem hic observandum quod licet Irenæus et alii tunc putaverint imprudenter egisse Victorem; tamen revera prudentissime egit, ut postea tota ecclesia judicavit."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. ii. cap. 19. [Tom. i. p. 330.]

³ "Φέρεται δ' εἰσέτι νῦν τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην τῆνικαδὲ συγκεκροτημένων γραφῇ, ὧν προϋτέτακτο Θεόφιλος τῆς ἐν Καισαρείᾳ παροικίας ἐπίσκοπος,

holden, whereof Theophilus of Cæsarea, and Narcissus of Jerusalem, were presidents; another at Rome, whereof Victor was president; and another, of the bishops of Pontus, whereof Palmas, as most ancient, was president: and in sundry other places other synods were called. But the synod of the bishops in Asia, whereof Polycrates was president, stiffly maintained the ancient custom that had long prevailed in those parts, and wrote an Epistle to Victor, and those of the Roman Church, to justify themselves in this behalf. Victor and his bishops, much offended with this their pertinacy (as they construed it), would for this cause have rejected them from their communion. But Irenæus, with some other of a milder spirit, and better temper, stayed them from such rash and violent proceedings; and Irenæus wrote his letters to this purpose to the bishop of Rome, and other his colleagues: so that here is nothing to prove the power of the pope. For what was resolved on, both touching the right of the observation, and the proceedings against them that disliked it, was resolved by the synods of bishops, and not by Victor alone: as likewise Irenæus was not alone, but many other joined with him in the reprehension of Victor, whose number and multitude prevailed much with him, and stayed his proceedings as well as the persuasions of Irenæus. And yet did not the western bishops take upon them to excommunicate those of Asia, as the cardinal untruly affirmeth, but only to reject them from their communion and fellowship; there being a very great difference between excommunication properly so named, and the rejecting of men from our communion of fellowship. For excommunication properly so named is a resolution to deny the sacraments to such as are to receive them of us, the abandoning of all fellowship with them, and the requiring and commanding of others to refrain from all communicating with them in private or public; and argueth him that so excommunicateth, to be superior in authority and

καὶ Νάρκισσος τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς δὲ ὁμοίως ἄλλη περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ζητήματος, ἐπίσκοπον Βικτόρα δηλοῦσα· τῶν τε κατὰ Πόντον ἐπισκόπων, ὧν Πάλμας ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προϋτέτακτο, καὶ τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν δὲ παροικίων ὡς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει· ἔτι τε τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ὀσροηνὴν καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖσε πόλεις· καὶ ἰδίως Βακχύλλου, τῆς Κορινθίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου, καὶ πλείστων ὅσων ἄλλων, οἱ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν δόξαν τε καὶ κρίσιν ἐξενεγμένοι τὴν αὐτὴν τέθεινται ψῆφον.”—Euseb. H. E. v. 23.

greater in place than they are whom he excommunicateth. But rejecting from communion, or refusing to communicate with men, may be found among them that are equal. So Cyril¹ wrote to Nestorius, that if he revoked not certain dangerous positions, he would communicate no longer with him. So the bishops of the East² told Julius bishop of Rome, that if he communicated with Athanasius they would no longer communicate with him. And such was the proceeding that Victor intended against those of Asia; and therefore proveth not that he was their superior, or had a commanding authority over them. And yet surely, howsoever it be true, that his manner of observation was better than theirs, whom he disliked, his intention upon such an occasion to have made a breach in the Christian Churches, was justly with some bitterness reprehended by Irenæus and his brethren. For howsoever Bellarmine³ would make the reader believe by alleging that of Blastus, who urged the keeping of Easter with the Jews, and sought to bring in Judaism, that Victor had reason to be violent as he was, as perceiving some ill meaning in them that held the Jewish observation; yet far be it from us to think that Polycarpus, and so many worthy and holy men as anciently kept that observation, were any way inclinable to Judaism. But this difference may be thought to have grown not from any diversity of judgment touching matters of faith, but for that in some places they thought it fit to keep this feast on the Lord's day, for very important reasons moving them so to do; and in other places, though they could

¹ “Εἰ μὴ δράσειεν ἡ σὴ εὐλαβεία κατὰ τὴν ὑρισθείσαν προθεσμίαν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι τοῦ μνημονευθέντος ὀσιωτάτου καὶ θεοσεβεστάτου ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν τοῦ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου Κελεστίνου, γίνωσκε σαυτὸν οὐδένα κλῆρον ἔχοντα μεθ’ ἡμῶν, οὐδὲ τόπον ἢ λόγον ἐν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐπισκόποις.”—In Concil. Ephes. Tom. i. cap. 14. [Labbe, cap. 26. Tom. iii. col. 946.]

² Sozom. Lib. iii. Cap. 7.

³ “Unus ex præcipuis auctoribus illius sententiæ de Paschate cum Judæis celebrando fuit Blastus, qui eo modo paulatim Judaismum introducere volebat, ut scribit Tertullianus de præscrip. in fine [cap. liii.] ‘Blastus,’ inquit, ‘latenter Judaismum vult introducere, Pascha enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse nisi secundum legem Mosis, decima quarta die mensis.’ Hic autem Blastus Romæ hæresim suam seminare cœpit tempore Victoris papæ, ut Eusebius testatur. Lib. v. Hist. cap. 15.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

have been content to have done so likewise upon the same reasons, yet kept they it after the old manner, for the avoiding of the scandal of the Jews, for the easier winning of them that were not yet gained to Christianity, and the holding of them in the love and liking of Christian profession that were already of Jews become Christians. The next instance is of Innocentius the First¹, who after that he heard of the death of Chrysostom, whom Theophilus had deposed, and the emperor Arcadius banished, excommunicated the emperor and empress, and anathematized Theophilus in such sort that he should utterly be excluded, and have no place among Christians. But this report may very justly be doubted of, the credit thereof resting only on the authority of Nicephorus; seeing the ancient historians² that report the proceedings of Theophilus and Arcadius against Chrysostom, and his complaints to the bishop of Rome, and other bishops of the West, of the wrongs that had been done unto him, report also the answer of the Roman bishop to have been, that he greatly pitied his case, but saw no hope of remedy, nor means to relieve him, unless a general council might be called, to which purpose he would do his best with the emperor; and that Chrysostom himself wished him not to proceed so far as to reject them from his communion that were his adversaries, for fear of further inconveniences; this being the contention almost of the whole world, and the Churches by occasion hereof everywhere brought upon their knees. Yea, all ancient historians are silent, and say nothing of this excommunication, but report the repulse³ which the messengers, the Roman bishop sent to the emperor to procure a council, received; and Theophilus⁴ (for ought I know) was ever holden a catholic

¹ "De censuris plurima essent exempla et quidem antiquissima. Nam Innocentius I. cum audivisset mortuum esse Chrysostomum, excommunicavit Imperatorem Arcadium et Eudoxiam uxorem ejus, qui non permiserant restitui Chrysostomum in suam sedem, ut ipse Innocentius jusserrat. Exstat de hac re epistola Innocentii apud Nicephorum. Lib. III. cap. 34."—[Id. Ibid.]

² Vide supra, Cap. 35. [p. 307].

³ Sozom. Lib. VIII. Cap. 18.

⁴ Theodoret, speaking of the injury done to Chrysostom, hath these words: "Alias virtutes authorum illius revereri cogor: qua de causa annitar, ut ipsorum nomina occultem."—Lib. v. Hist. Eccl. Cap. 34.

bishop, both by Hierome¹ and others to his dying day; notwithstanding these quarrels between him and Chrysostom. The excommunication of Leo the emperor, by Gregory the Third, whereof Zonaras writeth in the life of Leo Isaurus (which is a third instance of papal censures against the great men of the world), proveth not the matter in question. For Gregory did not anathematize Leo of himself alone, but with a synod of bishops; neither was he able by his own authority to stay the tribute that was wont to be paid to the emperor, but by his solicitation procured a confederacy of the French and Germans against the emperors of Constantinople, and by their means stayed the tribute that was wont to be paid; whereupon the Germans and French possessed Rome, and became lords of it. The last example is that of Nicholas the First², excommunicating Lotharius king of France, and his concubine Valdrada, together with the archbishops of Coleyn and Trevers. But the answer hereunto is easy. For first, this example proveth not the thing in question, to wit, that the pope hath an universal power over all the world, seeing all these were within the patriarchship of the bishop of Rome. And secondly we say, these circumstances of this proceeding are untruly reported by Bellarmine. For this is the true report which we find in Rhegino and others. Lotharius king of Lorraine, falling in love with Valdrada, which had been his concubine while he was yet a young man in his father's house, began to dislike Thietberga his wife. Hereupon he laboureth with the bishops of Trevers and Coleyn to find some means to put her away. They call a synod, wherein Thietberga is charged to have committed incest with her own brother, and thereupon pronounced an unfit wife for the king. The king thus freed from his wife, professeth he cannot live single; they pronounce it lawful for him to marry another

¹ Hierome wrote sundry epistles to Theophilus, full of all due respects, and turned his three Paschal books into Latin. Vide Epist. Hieron. Tom. II. [Epist. xcix. Tom. I. col. 603. Vid. etiam epist. Lxiii, Lxxxii, Lxxxvi, Lxxxviii.]

² "Nicolaus I. excommunicationem minatus est Lothario regi, et re ipsa excommunicavit concubinam ejus Valdradam, necnon archiepiscopos Coloniensem et Treverensem."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

Rhegino. Chron. Lib. II. [Ann. 864. In Rer. German. Script. Pistorii, Tom. I p. 64.] Otho Frisingens. Chron. Lib. VI. cap. 3. [p. 110. Bas. 1569.] Sigebert. Chron. Ann. 862. [Apud Pistor. ut supra. p. 795.]

wife, and he taketh Valdrada to wife whom he had formerly kept as his concubine. Nicholas the First, bishop of Rome, hearing of this, sendeth into France to learn the certainty. The legates he sendeth come to the king to expostulate the matter with him. The king answereth, that he did nothing but what the bishops of his kingdon in a general council had assured him was lawful to be done. Whereupon the bishops of Coleyn and Trevers were sent for to Rome, and the pope called a council, in which the opinions and proceedings of these bishops were condemned, and they degraded by all the bishops, presbyters and deacons, that were assembled in council. In all which narration there is no circumstance found that any way proveth the pope to have the fulness of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction: but the contrary rather may from hence be concluded, because nothing is done against these two bishops, but by a synod of bishops assembled by their own patriarch. "But," saith Bellarmine, "Pope Nicholas excommunicated the king, and Valdrada his supposed wife; therefore he is universal bishop." The former part of this saying is most untrue; for the pope did not excommunicate the king, but Valdrada only. And I think the excommunicating of one silly harlot, that had so grievously scandalized the Church of God, and whose cause was judged before in a synod, being brought thither, and there examined, by reason of the unjust proceedings of the bishops of Coleyn and Trevers against a lawful queen, in favour of her, will never by any good consequence prove the pope to be universal bishop; and yet these are all the proofs the cardinal can bring from the censures the ancient bishops of Rome are reported to have used: and therefore he proceedeth¹ to show and demonstrate the amplitude of the pope's illimited power and jurisdiction by the vicegerents he appointed in all parts of the Christian world, that were far remote from him, to do things in his name, and by his authority.

But for answer hereunto, we say, that neither this cardinal, nor any other can prove, that the bishops of Rome had any such vicars, vicegerents, or substitutes, but only within the

¹ "Argumentum octavum ex eo sumitur quod summus pontifex vicarios suos in variis regionibus aut ordinarie aut ad tempus habebat, cum reservatione tamen majorum causarum."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 20. [p. 330.]

compass of their own patriarchships : and that therefore from the having of them, nothing can be inferred for confirmation of their illimited power and authority. So Leo (as we read in his epistles¹) constituted Anastasius bishop of Thessalonica his vicegerent for the parts thereabouts, as other his predecessors had done former bishops of that Church. Which causing great resort thither upon divers occasions, may be thought to have been the reason why the council of Sardica² provideth that the clergymen of other Churches shall not make too long stay at Thessalonica. So the same Leo³ made Potentius the bishop his vicegerent in the parts of Africa; Hormisda⁴, Salustius bishop of Hispalis, in Boetica and Lusitania; and Gregory⁵, Virgilius bishop of Arles, in the regions of France: all these places being within the compass of the patriarchship of Rome, as Cusanus⁶ sheweth. And the same may be said of the bishop of Justiniana the first, who was appointed the bishop of Rome's vicegerent in those parts⁷,

¹ "Sicut prædecessores mei prædecessoribus tuis, ita etiam ego dilectioni tuæ priorum secutus exemplum, vices mei moderaminis delegavi."—Leo, Epist. lxxxiv. Ad Anastas. [Al. xiv. Tom. i. col. 683.]

² "Πολλάκις εἰς αὐτὴν [τὴν Θεσσαλονίκην] ἀπὸ ἐτέρων ἐπαρχίων πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι παραγίνονται....οὗτοι οἱ ὅροι οἱ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὀρισμένοι φυλαττέσθωσαν καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν προσώπων."—Concil. Sardic. Can. 16. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 669.]

³ "Vicem curæ nostræ proficiscenti a nobis fratri et consacerdoti nostro Potentio delegamus."—Leo, Epist. lxxxvii. [Al. xii. Tom. i. col. 658.]

⁴ "Vices nostras per Boeticam Lusitaniam que provincias, salvis privilegiis quæ metropolitanis episcopis decrevit antiquitas, præsentī tibi auctoritate committimus."—Hormisd. Epist. ad Salust. [Epist. xxvi. Labbe, Tom. v. col. 605.]

⁵ "Opportunum esse perspeximus in ecclesiis quæ sub regno præcedentissimi filii nostri Childeberti regis sunt, secundum antiquam consuetudinem, fratri nostro Virgilio Arelatensis civitatis episcopo vices nostras tribuere."—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. lii. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. liv. Tom. ii. col. 784.]

⁶ "Africa patriarchatui subest Romano, 11 Dist. 'Quis nesciat;' ubi enumerantur provinciæ Romanæ sedi subjectæ.

"Et 93 Dist. 'Juxta,' ubi dicit; 'Omnes episcopi qui ordinationibus apostolicæ sedis subjacent.'"—Nicol. De Cusa, De Concord. Cathol. Lib. ii. cap. 7. [p. 719. Bas. 1565. ex Gratiani Decreto. Dist. xi. cap. 11. et Dist. xciii. cap. 4. coll. 49, 557.]

⁷ "Per tempus autem beatissimum primæ Justinianæ nostræ patriæ archiepiscopum habere semper sub sua jurisdictione episcopos pro-

upon signification of the emperor's will and desire that it should be so. Neither doth the cardinal prove any other thing, whatsoever he maketh show of. For though Cyril bishop of Alexandria were the vicegerent of Cœlestinus, in the cause of Nestorius bishop of Constantinople, yet was he not his vicegerent in such sort as they were that were within his own patriarchship, as if he had had none authority of his own, but that only which Cœlestinus gave unto him. But Cœlestinus¹ having been informed by Cyril of the impieties of Nestorius, and having in his synods of the West condemned the same, joined his authority with the authority of Cyril, that so he might proceed against him, not only as of himself and out of the judgments of his own bishops, but also out of the consenting resolutions of them of the West. And therefore Evagrius² sheweth, that at or before the time appointed

vinciarum Daciæ, . . . et in subjectis sibi provinciis locum obtinere eum sedis apostolicæ Romæ, secundum ea quæ definita sunt a sanctissimo papa Vigilio.—Justinian. Auth. Collat. ix. Tit. 14. Siv. Novell. 131. [Cap. 3. Ad calc. Gothofred. Corp. Jur. Civil. p. 184. Amst. 1663.]

¹ “Συναφθείσης σοι τοίνυν τῆς αὐθεντίας τοῦ ἡμετέρου θρόνου, καὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ τοῦ τόπου διαδοχῇ ἐπ’ ἐξουσία χρησάμενος ταύτην ἐκβιβάσεις ἀκριβεῖ στερρότητι τὴν ἀπόφασιν, ἵνα ἡ ἐντὸς δέκα ἡμέρων, ἀριθμουμένων ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ὑπομνήσεως ταύτης, τὰ κακὰ κηρύγματα ἑαυτοῦ ἐγγράφῳ ὁμολογία ἀθετήσῃ, καὶ ἑαυτὸν διαβεβαιώσῃται ταύτην κατέχειν τὴν πίστιν περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἣν καὶ ἡ Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἡ τῆς σῆς ἀγιοτήτος ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἡ καθόλου καθοσίωσις κατέχει, ἡ ἐὰν μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσῃ, εὐθὺς ἡ σὴ ἀγιότης ἐκείνης τῆς ἐκκλησίας προνοησαμένη μάθῃ αὐτὸν παντὶ τρόπῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωματίου ἀποκινητέον τυγχάνειν.”—Epist. Cœlestin. ad Cyrill. Concil. Ephes. Lib. i. cap. 16. [Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 897.]

“Ἴδου τοίνυν ἅμα τῇ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ τῇ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην Ῥώμην συνειλεγμένη, προεδρεύοντος τοῦ ὀσιωτάτου καὶ θεοσεβεστάτου ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν Κελεστίνου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, καὶ τρίτῳ σοι τούτῳ διαμαρτυρόμεθα γράμματι, συμβουλεύοντες ἀπόσχεσθαι μὲν τῶν οὕτω σκαιῶν καὶ διεστραμμένων δογμάτων.”—Epist. Cyrilli ad Nestor. [Labbe, col. 945.]

² “Νεστόριος μὲν οὐ μακρὰν τῆς Ἐφέσου διεστώσης τῆς Κωνσταντίνου φθάνει πάντως. Καὶ Κύριλλος δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν πρὸ τῆς ἐπαγγελθείσης ἡμέρας ἀπηντήκασιν. Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ τῆς Ἀντιοχείων πρόεδρος σὺν τοῖς ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν ἀπελείφθη τῆς ὀρισθείσης ἡμέρας. . . . Ὡς οὖν ἡ κυρία παρώχῃκεν ἡμέρας πεντεκαίδεκα οἱ ἐπὶ τοῦτο συναθροισθέντες, ὥς οὐ φθησομένων τῶν ἀνατολικῶν, ἡ εἰ καὶ φθαῖεν μετὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου τριβὴν ἀλίσζονται, Κυρίλλου τοῦ θεσπεσίου διέποντος καὶ τὸν Κελεστίνου τόπον τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν, ὥς εἴρηται, τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης πρυτανεύοντος· καλοῦσι δ’ οὖν καὶ τὸν Νεστόριον,

by the emperor, Nestorius and Cyril came to Ephesus, where a council was to be holden: and that John of Antioch with his bishops being not come, after fifteen days' stay, Cyril bishop of Alexandria, the greatest of all the bishops that were present (who also supplied the place of Cœlestinus), with the rest of the bishops, thought good to send for Nestorius, and to require him to appear in the synod, to answer to the crimes objected to him. Whereby it is evident, that (Nestorius being to be judged in a general council) Cyril being the greatest of the bishops that were present, (the bishop of Rome neither coming nor sending at the first) was in his own right president of that assembly¹. But the bishop of Rome, who could not come, (but having assembled his bishops in the West, had judged and condemned him,) joined his authority with Cyril, the principal of the bishops that were present, that so nothing might be wanting to the perfection of a general council. So that it is most certain, that Cyril was president of the council of Ephesus, not as a vicegerent only to the bishop of Rome, but in his own right, though he had the authority, direction, and consenting concurrence of the bishop of Rome, and all the western bishops, joined with the power and authority which he and the rest of the bishops present had of themselves. And therefore Leo² saith in express words, that Cyril was president of the council of Ephesus, as likewise Photius³ and others affirm. The same answer may serve for Acacius⁴. For he was not vicegerent

προτρέποντες τοῖς ἐπαγομένοις ἀπολογήσασθαι.—Evagr. H. E. Lib. I. cap. 3, 4.

¹ Relat. sanctæ Synodi ad pientiss. Imp. inter Epist. Synodales vocat Cyrillum caput congregatorum Episcoporum. [*Κεφαλὴς τῶν ἐπηγγελλένων ἁγιωτάτων ἀρχιεπισκόπων Κυρίλλου.*—Labbe, Tom. III. col. 1185.]

² “Prioris Ephesinæ synodi cui sanctæ memoriæ Cyrillus episcopus tunc præsedet, contra Nestorium specialiter statuta permaneant.”—Leo, Epist. xlvii. [Al. xciii. Tom. I. col. 1073.]

³ “Præsides erant Cyrillus ille celeberrimus inter patres qui propter virtutem sapientiæ que divitias magnæ civitatis Alexandriæ sedem obtinebat, et Cœlestini Romani pontificis implebat sedem atque personam gerebat, et Memno,” &c.—Photius de Septem Synodis. [Ad calc. Nomocanon. p. 267. Par. 1615.]

⁴ “Risimus autem quod prærogativam volunt Acacio comparari, quia episcopus fuerit regiæ civitatis.... Numquid Acacius ut Joannem qualemlibet hominem catholicum tamen a catholicis ordinatum de Alexandria excluderet, Petrum que in hæresi jam detectum atque

of the bishop of Rome, in hearing and determining the cause of Peter bishop of Alexandria, (who was an Eutychian heretic,) as having none authority of his own, but there was a joint concurrence of the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Constantinople; the latter having, besides his own right and interest, the full power and authority of the other: and being likewise to use the help of the emperor for the reducing of the Church of Alexandria to the unity of the faith again, in which business he failed; for though at first he condemned Peter bishop of Alexandria, yet afterwards he was content to communicate with him: for which cause he was justly reprehended as not answering the trust that was reposed in him, and as being a favourer of heretics, and so in a sort an heretic himself. To these allegations which we have already heard, Harding¹ in his answer to bishop Jewel's Challenge addeth another, of a bishop of Alexandria being vicegerent to the bishop of Rome, out of the epistle of Bonifacius the Second, to Eulalius or Eulabius. But Bellarmine² refuteth that epistle,

damnatum absque sedis apostolicæ consultatione reciperet aliqua synodo saltem illic habita, hoc audacter arripuit, ut Calendionem de Antiochia pelleret, hæreticum que Petrum quem ipse quoque damnaverat absque notitia sedis apostolicæ rursus admitteret, aliqua synodo id fecisse monstratur?—Gelas. Epist. xiii. Ad Episc. Dardan. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 332.]

¹ "Now that the bishop of Rome had always care and rule over all other bishops, specially of them of the East, (for touching them of the West Church it is generally confessed), beside a hundred other evident arguments, this is one very sufficient, that he had in the East to do his stead three delegates or vicars; now commonly they be named legates. And this for the commodity of the bishops there whose Churches were far distant from Rome. The one was the bishop of Constantinople, as we find it mentioned in *Epistola Simplicii ad Acacium Constantinopolitanum*. The second was the bishop of Alexandria, as the epistle of Bonifacius the Second to Eulalius recordeth. The third was the bishop of Thessalonica, as it is at large declared in the eighty-second epistle of Leo ad *Anastasium Thessalonicensem*."—Harding, *Apud Jewel*. [Apology, Art. 4. Vol. II. p. 246. Oxon. 1848.]

² "Respondeo primum, valde mihi eas epistolas esse suspectas; nam in primis pugnare videntur cum iis quæ diximus de conjunctione Augustini, Eugenii, Fulgentii, et aliorum Africanorum cum Romana ecclesia. Deinde Eulabius Alexandrinus, ad quem Bonifacius scribere videtur, nullus fuit, aut certe eo tempore non fuit, ut patet ex chronologia Nicephori Constantinopolitani."—Bellarm. *De Pont. Rom.* Lib. II. cap. 25. [p. 336.]

and showeth that it is counterfeit, and that there never was any such Eulabius, to whom Bonifacius might write: and therefore we will no longer insist upon the examination of the same, but proceed to the proofs which our adversaries bring from appeals made to Rome.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

OF APPEALS TO ROME.

FOR the clearing of the matter of appeals we must observe, that they are of three sorts: of laymen, of inferior clergymen, and of bishops. Of the appeals of laymen there is no mention in all antiquity: and yet now the bishops of Rome reserve all the greater causes even concerning the laity to themselves alone, forbidding the ordinary guides of the Church to intermeddle with them; and very ordinarily admit appeals of laymen, to the infinite vexation of men, and the great hinderance of the course of all justice. Whereas it is most wisely and rightly ordered, each bishop having his portion of the flock of Christ committed to him, as Cyprian¹ observeth, that they that are committed to their charge should not be permitted to run hither and thither, but be judged there, where the things, for which they are called in question, were done, and where the accusers and witnesses may be present.

Concerning inferior clergymen, the holy bishops in the council of Milevis² speak in this sort: "It hath seemed good unto us, that if presbyters, deacons, and other inferior clergymen, complain of the judgments of their own bishops, the

¹ "Oportet utique eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare, nec episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sua subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint."—Cyprian. Lib. i. Epist. iii. [Al. Epist. lix. p. 136.]

² "Placuit, ut presbyteri diaconi vel cæteri inferiores clerici in causis quas habuerint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini episcopi eos audiant: et inter eos quicquid est finiant adhibiti ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. Quod si et ab eis provocandum putaverint, non provocent, nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad

neighbour bishops intreated by them with the consent of their bishops shall hear them and make an end; and if they think good to appeal from their judgment, it shall not be lawful for them to appeal, but only to the councils of Africa, or to the primates of their own provinces. And if they shall make their appeal beyond the seas, no man in Africa shall receive them to the communion." This whole council Innocentius the First approved, as it appeareth by his epistle¹, which we find in the book of the epistles of St Augustine. "Hereunto," Bellarmine² saith, "some answer with Gratian³: who addeth to the canon of this council, forbidding appeals to be made beyond the seas, an exception, 'unless it be to the see apostolic.' But this exception," saith Bellarmine, "seemeth not fitting, seeing the Africans made this decree, that men should not appeal beyond the seas, especially in respect of the Church of Rome, and to restrain the making of appeals thither; there never being any appeal from the Africans to any other Church but to the Church of Rome only. And yet Stapleton⁴ answereth the authority of this council as Gratian doth, and that out of Julius and Fabianus, bishops of Rome, as he saith. "The council of Sardica⁵," saith Bellarmine, "decreed that

primates provinciarum suarum. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem accipiatur."—Concil. Milevit. Can. 22. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1542.]

¹ Inter Epist. August. Epist. xciii. [Al. clxxxii. Tom. II. col. 638, sq.]

² "Respondent aliqui cum Gratiano, qui addidit ad hunc canonem exceptionem, 'nisi forte ad apostolicam sedem appelletur.' Sed hæc exceptio non videtur quadrare, nam præcipue propter Romanam ecclesiam Africani statuerunt, ut non liceret appellare ultra mare: non enim appellari unquam consuevit ultra mare ab Africanis, nisi ad Romanam sedem. Neque opus est confugere ad has angustias exceptionis, cum solutio vera sit in promptu."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 24. [Tom. I. p. 332.]

³ Gratian. [Decret. Part. 2.] Caus. 2. Quæst. 6. cap. 'Placuit.' [col. 849.]

⁴ "Hoc totum factum est *ad peregrina judicia vitanda*, non ad Romanæ sedis auctoritatem excludendam. Aperte hoc habet Julius, et ante eum Fabianus Papa."—Stapleton. Controv. III. De Prim. subject. Potest. Eccles. Quæst. 7. Explic. Art. [Tom. I. p. 719. Par. 1620.]

⁵ "Εἰ τις διάκονος ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ καὶ τις τῶν κληρικῶν ἀκοινώνητος γένηται, καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον ἐπίσκοπον τὸν εἰδότα αὐτὸν καταφύγοι, γινώσκοντα ἀποκεκινῆσθαι αὐτὸν τῆς κοινωνίας παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, μὴ χρῆναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ὕβριν ποιοῦντα παρέχειν αὐτῷ κοινωνίαν. Εἰ δὲ

the causes of presbyters and inferior clergymen appealing from the judgments of their own bishops should be determined and ended by the neighbour-bishops: and pope Zosimus, as appeareth by the sixth council of Carthage, and the epistle of the same council to Bonifacius the pope, required the same canon to be revived¹." Augustine² likewise sheweth that it was not lawful for those of the clergy under the degree of bishops to appeal out of Africa. Neither was this the peculiar privilege of Africa alone. For the council of Chalcedon³ ordained, that if a clergyman have ought against another of the clergy, the matter shall be heard by the bishop, or by arbitrators chosen by both parties, with the bishop's allowance: but if he have ought against his bishop, he shall prosecute the same complaint in the synod of the province. This canon of the council of Chalcedon the emperor confirmed, saying⁴, "If any of the clergy complain against his bishop for any matter,

τολμήσοι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι γινωσκέτω συνελθόντων ἐπισκόπων ἀπολογία εἰαυτὸν ὑπεύθυνον καθιστάναι."—Concil. Sardic. Can. 17. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 668.]

¹ "Concilium Sardicense quod episcopus voluit posse appellare ad pontificem, idem voluit causas presbyterorum et minorum clericorum terminari apud vicinos episcopos; ita ut liceat minoribus clericis appellare a suo episcopo ad alios episcopos ejusdem provinciæ. Quos duo canones renovari voluit papa Zosimus, et executioni mandari in Africa, ut patet ex concilio 6 Carthag. et ex epistola ejusdem concilii ad Bonifacium Papam."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "Neque enim de presbyteris aut diaconis aut inferioris ordinis clericis, sed de collegis agebatur, qui possent aliorum collegarum judicio, præsertim ecclesiarum apostolicarum, causam suam integram reservare."—August. Epist. clxii. [Al. cxliii. Tom. II. col. 91. f.]

³ "Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχοι, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια κατατρεχέτω, ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὴν ὑπόθεσιν γυμναζέτω παρὰ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἣ γοῦν γνώμη αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου παρ' οἷς ἂν τὰ ἀμφοτέρα μέρη βούλεται τὰ τῆς δίκης συγκροτεῖσθω. Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσῃ κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις. Εἰ δέ τις κληρικὸς ἔχοι πρᾶγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω."—Concil. Chalced. Can. 9. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1685.]

⁴ "Si a clero aut alio quocunque aditio contra episcopum fiat propter quamlibet causam, apud sanctissimum ejus metropolitam secundum canones et leges huic præbeat finem. Si vero contra metropolitam talis aditio fiat ab episcopo aut clero aut alia quacunque persona, dioceseos illius beatissimus patriarcha simili modo causam judicet."—Justinian. Novell. cxxiii. cap. 22. [Ad calc. Gothofred. Corp. Jur. Civil. p. 173. Amst. 1663.]

let the cause be judged by the metropolitan, according to the sacred rules, and the imperial laws. And if any man appeal from his sentence, let the cause be brought to the archbishop or patriarch of that diocese, and let him, according to the canons, make a final end." And yet, notwithstanding these canons above recited precisely forbidding inferior clergymen to appeal to Rome, we find that the bishops of Rome¹ admitted the appeal of one Apiarius, judged and condemned in Africa; which caused a great difference between the Africans and him. Whereupon the fathers in the council of Africa, with the bishop of Rome (as it beseemeth him), do reject and repel the wicked and unlawful appeals, as well of presbyters, as of other inferior clergymen; seeing the ending and determining of their causes is by no decree of any synod denied to the Church of Africa, and the Nicene canons most clearly commit both inferior clergymen and bishops to their own metropolitans. Bellarmine², to clear the pope from intrusion, and to avoid the testimonies and authorities of the holy bishops and pastors of the Church, which we have produced to show the unlawfulness of appeals to Rome, answereth first, "that though they of the inferior clergy were prohibited to appeal to the pope, yet he was not forbidden to admit their appeals;" which is a most strange answer. For if they in appealing did ill, and violated the canons, he could not but offend in admitting such their appeals. And therefore they of Africa³ tell the pope, that it beseemeth him to repel such appeals; and that to admit them, is to bring in the smoky puff of worldly pride into the Church; professing that the ending of such matters belongeth to the Church of Africa, and complaining of intolerable wrongs and injuries done unto them,

¹ Ut patet ex epist. Concil. Afric. ad Cœlestin. [Labbe, Tom. III. col. 532.]

² "Respondeo, licet prohibitum fuerit clericis inferioris ordinis appellare ab episcopis suæ provinciæ, non tamen prohibitum fuit nec prohiberi potuit summo pontifici, ne si vellet eos admitteret. Præterea Romani pontifices non tam admiserunt appellationem Apiarii quam audierunt ejus querimonias, et mandarunt Africanis ut ejus causam diligenter cognoscerent, et fideliter judicarent. Apparet enim ex illis duabus epistolis, bis Apiarium venisse Romam, et utraque vice remissum in Africam, et ibi in concilio judicatum post reditum ejus ab urbe."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

³ Ep. prædict. Conc. Afric. c. 105.

when such appeals are admitted; whence it is consequent, that the pope may not admit them. Secondly, he answereth, that the bishop of Rome admitted not the appeal of Apiarius, but heard his complaints, and commanded them of Africa more diligently to examine his cause: whereas it is most plain and evident, that the pope, upon his appeal, unadvisedly received him to his communion, and restored him to his degree and place again. Besides that to hear complaints, and to command a review, is, in the judgment of all men of sense and understanding, a kind of an admitting of an appeal; seeing no such thing can be done but by him that hath power to judge of their judgment whom he commandeth to review and re-examine that they have formerly judged.

Concerning bishops, the council of Chalcedon¹ decreed, that if a bishop have ought against the metropolitan, he shall go to the primate of the diocese, or to the see of the princely city of Constantinople, that there the matter may be examined and heard. And the emperor² confirming the same canon, decreed, that if the bishops of one synod have any matter of variance among themselves, either for ecclesiastical right, or any other occasions; first the metropolitan, and the other bishops of the synod, shall examine and determine the cause; and if either part dislike the judgment, then the patriarch of that diocese shall give them audience according to the ecclesiastical canons, and imperial laws, neither side having liberty to contradict his judgment. This decree of the emperor Gregory the First³ reciteth, and alloweth: only adding, that if there be neither metropolitan nor patriarch, then the matter

¹ “Εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίη, καταλαμβάνετω ἢ τὸν ἑξάρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω.”—Concil. Chalced. Can. 9. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1685.]

² “Si quis sanctissimorum episcoporum ejusdem synodi dubitationem aliquam ad invicem habeat, sive pro ecclesiastico jure sive pro aliis quibusdam rebus, prius metropolita eorum cum aliis de sua synodo episcopis causam examinet et judicet. Et si non rata habuerit utraque pars quæ judicata sunt, tunc beatissimus patriarcha dioceseos illius inter eos audiat, et illa determinet quæ ecclesiasticis canonibus et legibus consonant; nulla parte ejus sententiæ contradicere valente.”—Justinian. Novell. cxxiii. cap. 22. [Citat. Not. 4. p. 375. supra.]

³ “Contra hæc si dictum fuerit quia nec metropolitam habuit nec patriarcham, dicendum est quia a sede apostolica, quæ omnium ec-

must be ended by the apostolic see, which is the head of all Churches. So that even in his judgment, when there is a patriarch, no bishop may appeal from him to Rome, but every one is bound to stand to the end that he shall make. The eighth general council¹ in like sort appointeth bishops complaining of their metropolitans to go to the patriarch, that he may make an end, and requireth either side to stand to the end that he shall make; seeing the more honourable bishops out of sundry provinces called together by him sit in council with him. Yet Zosimus, Bonifacius, and Cœlestinus, bishops of Rome², by their agents in the councils of Africa urged and claimed a pretended right to admit appeals of bishops from any part of the world, as from the canons of the Nicene council. But the worthy bishops there present looking into the decrees of that council, and finding no such thing as was alleged, lest haply those copies of the council which they had might be defective, imperfect, or corrupted, sent to the most reverend patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, for the authentical and indubitate copies; but could find no such thing in them when they came, as was alleged by the agents of the bishop of Rome. And therefore they wrote unto him, and prayed him no more so easily to admit men coming to him with appeals and complaints, nor to receive to his communion such as they should excommunicate, because the Nicene council hath forbidden all such admission; committing not only laymen and inferior clergymen, but bishops³ also, to their own metropolitans; and requiring that bishops put from the communion in their own provinces,

clesiarum caput est, causa hæc audienda ac dirimenda fuerat.—Greg. Lib. xi. Epist. liv. [Al. Lib. xiii. Epist. xlv. Tom. ii. col. 1254.]

¹ “*Episcopos concurrere ad patriarchale caput decernimus, qui a metropolitans suis talia se pertulisse fatentur, ut apud patriarcham et metropolitans qui sub ipso sunt justam et sine suspicione sententiam quod movetur negotium accipiat.*”—Concil. Constantinop. iv. General. viii. Can. 26. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 650.]

² Epist. citat. a Conc. Afric. sive Carthag. 6.

³ The Africans, though within the patriarchship of Rome, disliked the appeals of bishops to Rome, because they might have right against their metropolitans, if they wronged them, in a general synod of Africk, wherein the primate sat as president: for otherwise bishops wronged by their metropolitans might by the canons appeal to their own patriarch.

should not be by other hastily, suddenly, or unduly restored to the communion. And farther, they besought the Roman bishops to repel, as beseemeth them, the wicked appeals of presbyters, and other inferior clergymen, because no decree of any council hath prejudiced the Church of Africa in this behalf; but all the fathers most prudently and justly decreed and determined, that all matters should be ended in the place where they arise, seeing no province can lack the grace of the Holy Ghost, whereby the bishops of Christ may be able both wisely to see, and constantly to maintain the right; and especially for that it is lawful for every one that shall mislike the judgment of them that have the hearing of his cause, to appeal to the councils of his province, or to a general council, unless haply any man will think that God will inspire the trial of justice into one man alone, and that he will deny the same to a great number of bishops assembled in council; and farther they add, that these beyond-sea judgments cannot be thought good and of force, whereunto the persons of the witnesses necessary for the finding out of the truth cannot be brought, either in respect of the infirmity of their sex or age, or by reason of some other impediment. And thus we see that the bishops of Rome could not demonstrate their right to receive appeals of bishops, refusing to stand to the judgments of their own metropolitans and synods, out of the Nicene council, but failed in the issue. Yet may we not hereupon charge them with falsification or mistaking, say the worthy proctors of the Roman Church¹: but we must rather say with counterfeit Athanasius, in his Epistle to Felix, that the copies of the Nicene council were corrupted, or, in his Epistle to Mark the bishop of Rome, that they were burned, than that we should yield any such thing. And yet surely if they were corrupted, they were not burned; and if they were burnt, they were not corrupted: and that the Arians should corrupt the copies of the Nicene council in other things, and leave it inviolable in that part that toucheth them most, and condemneth their heresy, is strange and unlikely. Bellarmine²

¹ "Quod illi canones non sint omnes probant nonnulli ex epist. Athanasii ad Marcum papam, in qua petit exemplum Nicæni concilii ex Romani pontificis scrinio, asserens exempla quæ erant Alexandriæ fuisse cremata ab Arianis."

² "Sed hoc argumentum ridetur a Magdeburgensibus, et vere non

not, our adversaries themselves being judges. But Gelasius¹ in his epistle to the bishops of Dardania, saith, “the see apostolic by her authority condemned Dioscorus, bishop of the second see:” therefore the pope hath all ecclesiastical power originally seated in himself alone. Truly this consequence is no better than the former. For by the see apostolic Gelasius understandeth the Roman bishop, and the bishops of the West subject to him, who synodically condemned Dioscorus, and yet not without the concurrence of many other bishops: nor so as that the judgment was thought perfect, till an œcumenical synod² confirmed it, as it appeareth by the course of histories.

The next example is the deposition of Flavianus bishop of Antioch, by Damasus bishop of Rome³. But this example might have been spared: for it is most certain that Damasus did not depose Flavianus. The circumstances of the history are these: Eustathius, that worthy bishop of Antioch, who made that excellent oration in the praise of Constantine in the council of Nice⁴, and was so earnest and zealous a defender of the true faith against the Arians, being by certain Arians⁵ cast out of his bishopric, and banished, upon the occasion of a lewd woman charging him to have committed adultery with her, but afterward confessing she had wronged him, and that she had been suborned by those Arians so to accuse him, Eulalius was chosen into his place, whom Euphronius succeeded, and after him Placitus obtained the bishopric. All these did secretly favour Arianism, and therefore many, both of the people and priests, forsaking the public assemblies, had their private meetings, and were called Eustathians; for that, after the banishment of Eustathius, they began thus to assemble together. Stephen⁶ succeeded Placitus, Leontius Stephen, and Eudoxius⁷

¹ “Item Gelasius in epistola ad episcopos Dardaniæ: ‘Dioscorus,’ inquit, ‘secundæ sedis præsulem sua auctoritate sedes apostolica damnavit.’ Et ibidem, ‘B. Petri sedes Alexandrinum Petrum, quem se tantummodo damnassee non etiam solvisse noverat, non recipit.’—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² Vide Acta Concil. Chalced. [Act. iii. Apud Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 372, sqq.]

³ “Præterea Flavianum patriarcham Antiochenum deposuit Damasus.”—Bellarm. [ibid.] ex Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. cap. 23.

⁴ Theodoret. H. E. Lib. i. cap. 7.

⁵ Ibid. cap. 21, 22.

⁶ Idem. Lib. ii. cap. 24.

⁷ Ibid. cap. 25.

Leontius; who obtaining to be bishop of Constantinople¹, left the Church of Antioch void; whereupon the bishops of the province assembled together, and chose Miliesius to be bishop, some of them hoping that he would favour Arianism, and other knowing that he was an orthodox; the error of the one side mis-persuaded of the man, and the true knowledge the other had of him, made both willingly to consent to his election and ordination. But so soon as the Arians perceived what he was, they deposed him, and sent him into banishment, placing Euzoius in his place: which when the people and priests that were catholic perceived, who had long endured the insolencies of the Arians, they divided themselves, and refused to communicate with him. After a while Miliesius², in the time of Julian, returneth from banishment; to whom though such catholics as divided themselves upon dislike of Euzoius, presently cleaved; yet would not they that first divided themselves in respect of Eustathius, neither at the first ordination of Miliesius, though Eustathius were then dead, nor now upon his return, by any means be induced to hold communion with him and his: which Lucifer, one of them that had been in banishment with Athanasius, seeing and pitying, laboured with them what he could to bring them to unity. But when he saw they would not be induced to join with Miliesius, and that Paulinus was their leader, he made him their bishop: which act of his made the schism more dangerous than before, and of longer continuance than otherwise happily it would have been; for it continued eighty-five years³. Miliesius⁴ perceiving Paulinus to be ordained bishop over them that were divided from his communion, seemed no whit therewith to be offended or displeased, but spake peaceably to Paulinus, desiring him that they might join their flocks, and feed them together: "and if," said he, "the throne divide us, let me lay the gospel in it, and then do thou sit in it sometimes, and I will sit in it at other times; and if I die before thee, thou shalt have the care and charge of all: if thou die before me, the care and charge of all shall be devolved to me." This council Paulinus would not hearken unto, and therefore the emperor's officers adjudged the Churches to Miliesius, and the guiding of the divided sheep to Paulinus: whereupon, when Miliesius died, though Paulinus would have

¹ Cap. 31. ² Lib. III. cap. 4. ³ Ibid. cap. 5. ⁴ Lib. v. cap. 3.

had the place¹, yet he was refused, because he had refused to hearken to the counsel of Milesius; and the bishops chose Flavianus, a man very conspicuous for his great labours, and one that had exposed himself to many dangers for the good of the Church. Yet this ordination greatly displeased the Egyptians and Romans. The reason of which their so great dislike², was for that when there was much contention between Milesius and Paulinus, it was so agreed, that all they that were fit for that bishopric, or might in likelihood be in any hope or expectation of it, should swear neither to seek it nor accept it, while either of these lived; nor no way to hinder, but that after the death of the one, the other might have the full and entire government of the whole; of which number it was thought that Flavianus was one, and that therefore not without perjury, contrary to his vow and oath, he had hindered the reuniting of the divided parts of the Church. This dislike conceived against Flavianus died not when Paulinus died³; but though Evagrius most unlawfully and against the canons had gotten the bishopric, having no ordination but from his predecessor, (whereas the canons allow no such nomination of a successor, and besides require the presence of the bishops of the province,) yet would they that at first disliked the ordination of Flavianus take no knowledge of any of these things, but communicated with Evagrius, and incited the emperor against Flavianus; who, being urged continually by the bishop of Rome, and others, no longer to suffer Flavianus to enjoy his place, and told, that suppressing tyrants he did ill to suffer the violaters of the laws of the Church to escape unpunished; sent for Flavianus, thinking to send him to Rome, there to be judged in a synod of bishops: who when he came into the presence of the emperor, told him confidently, that if any man would object against his doctrine or life, he would desire to be tried by no other judges but his greatest enemies; but if the matter were for his episcopal chair, he would willingly relinquish it, that the emperor might commit it to whom he would: upon which his confident answer, the emperor dismissed him, and bade him to go home, and feed the flock

¹ Ibid. cap. 23.

² Sozomen. Lib. vii. cap. 3. & 11. Socrates, Lib. v. cap. 15.

³ Theodoret. Lib. v. cap. 23.

committed to him. Yet long after, many complaints were again renewed against him to the emperor by sundry bishops being at Rome, fearing to tax the emperor himself for that he suppressed not the tyranny of Flavianus; but the emperor bade them say what that tyranny was, as if he were Flavianus, for that he had undertaken the defence of him. Which when they refused to do, professing themselves unwilling to stand upon terms with the emperor, he exhorted them to lay aside their foolish quarrellings, and to reunite the Churches that had long without cause been divided: for that Paulinus was now dead, and Evagrius came unjustly to the bishopric; and the ordination of Flavianus was so far forth allowed of, that all the Churches of the East, with the Churches of Asia, Pontus, Thracia, and Illyricum, held Flavianus to be lawful bishop of the East. Hereupon the bishops promised to surcease, and that if Flavianus would send legates unto them, they would kindly entreat them, and hold communion with him. Howsoever it appeareth by Socrates¹, that after the death of Evagrius he procured there should be no bishops chosen in opposition to him; and first pacified Theophilus, and afterwards by his means Damasus. Sozomen² reporteth, that Chrysostom, after he was made bishop of Constantinople, finding that the Egyptian and western bishops dissented from those of the East, in respect of Flavianus, and that all the Churches throughout the whole empire were divided about him, besought Theophilus to be pacified towards him, and to assist him for the reconciling of Damasus also. To this suit of Chrysostom Theophilus yielded, and sent certain to Rome; who prevailing, sailed into Egypt, and from thence, as also from Rome, brought letters of reconciliation and peace, both from the Egyptian and Western bishops. This history, I think, will never prove that the bishop of Rome deposed Flavianus, bishop of Antioch, and that he could not hold his bishopric till the bishop of Rome consented to him. For the thing that was sought was not his holding of his bishopric, as Bellarmine untruly reporteth, but the peace and concord of the Churches, divided about him. Neither was the difference only between him and Damasus, but all the bishops of Egypt and the West dissented from him likewise: and therefore Ambrose sheweth, that the examining of the matter between Evagrius and him,

¹ Socrat. H. E. v. 5.² Sozomen. H. E. III. 3.

was committed to Theophilus and the bishops of Egypt¹, and desireth him to make relation of the end he should make to the bishop of Rome, that he also agreeing thereunto, an universal peace might be concluded. So that nothing can be concluded out of this history for proof of the universal power of popes: seeing Damasus could neither of himself alone, nor with the concurrence of the western bishops, depose Flavianus, nor by any means persuade the emperor to thrust him out of his place; but was sharply reprov'd by the emperor for quarrelling with him, and required to be at peace with him, that so the Churches formerly divided without cause might be reunited.

The next instance of the pope's deposing bishops is that of Sixtus the Third², who deposed Polychronius bishop of Jerusalem, if we may believe Bellarmine. But in truth there was never any such thing. The circumstances of the whole proceeding against Polychronius, bishop of Jerusalem, (if there be any credit in the report of pope Nicholas³, and the acts of the council under Sixtus the Third) were these. Two things specially were objected to him: the one, that he went about to violate the ancient bounds of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of bishops, set and limited by the fathers, to prefer himself before the other principal bishops, and to make his see the first, whereas in truth it was the last amongst the patriarchal sees; the other, that simoniacally he conferred ecclesiastical honours upon such as would purchase the same. Hereupon the bishops subject to him, not willing to proceed against him themselves alone, complained to the bishop of Rome, and showed him how much he was wronged by the undue claims of this bishop. The bishop of Rome took not upon him to do anything of himself, but called a synod of the bishops of the

¹ "Sane referendum arbitramur ad sanctum fratrem nostrum Romanæ sacerdotem ecclesiæ; quoniam præsumimus ea te judicaturum quæ etiam illi displicere nequeant. Ita enim utile erit consultum sententiæ, ita pacis et quietis securitas."—Ambros. Epist. lxxviii. [Al. Epist. lvi. Tom. II. col. 1007. Par. 1690.]

² "Episcopum etiam Hierosolymitanum Polychronium deposuit Sixtus III. misso ad hoc in Hierusalem S. Leone archidiacono, qui postea fuit papa, ut patet ex Tom. I. Consilior. in Act. Sixti III. [Vid. Acta Sixti III. Apud Labbe, Concil. Tom. IV. col. 515, sqq.]

³ Vid. Epist. Nicolai papæ ad Michael, Imp. [Epist. viii. Labbe, Tom. IX. col. 1325.]

West, and by their advice, with the concurrence of the emperor, directed certain out of the West, authorized by the whole synod, to go and sit in council with the bishops of those parts: who together with them examining the crimes objected to Polychronius, and finding that he was truly charged with them, deposed him from his bishopric; so that the bishop of Rome did not depose him of himself, but only called a synod, (as in such a case it was fit he should) and the synod deposed him; but in truth it is rather to be thought that the acts of the council under Sixtus the Third are counterfeit, and of no credit. For Binius¹ sheweth that there was no such Polychronius bishop of Jerusalem in those times, and bringeth many other reasons to disprove the acts of this supposed council, besides that the absurdity in the proceedings bewrayeth them to be counterfeit. For what can be more absurd, than that the accuser of Polychronius, making good his accusation, should be condemned for accusing him, and he first condemned; and then presently, upon slender or no reasons at all, restored again?

Thus we see how little our adversaries are able to say for proof of the pope's universal power, exercised in deposing bishops. Wherefore let us now proceed to see if they can produce any better proofs of his restoring such as were deposed by others. The first example they bring, is the restitution of Basilides², a bishop in Spain; but they know right well that the bishop of Rome did not restore him to his bishopric, and that therefore this allegation serveth to no purpose but to abuse the reader, and to make him believe they say something,

¹ "Temporibus Sixti vel Leonis pontificum ab anno Domini 429, usque ad annum Christi 457 non modo non aliquis Polychronius Hierosolymitanæ sedis episcopum egit, sed neque apud Nicephorum episcopum Constantinopolitanum, qui texuit catalogum episcoporum Hierosolymitanorum, neque apud Callistum vel Evagrium qui horum res in orientali ecclesia gestas prosecuti sunt, usquam vel levis saltem Polychronii nominis mentio habetur."—Binius in annot. ad Concil. Roman. sub Sixto III. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 524.]

² "Nec rescindere ordinationem jure perfectam potest, quod Basilides post crimina sua detecta et conscientiam etiam propria confessione nudatam Romam pergens Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum et gestæ rei ac tacitæ veritatis ignarum fefellit, ut exambiret reponi se injuste in episcopatum, de quo fuerat juste depositus."—Cyprian. Lib. i. Epist. iv. [Al. Epist. lxxvii. p. 173.]

when they say nothing. The circumstances of the matter concerning Basilides, are these, laid down in Cyprian's epistles. Basilides and Martialis had defiled themselves with some kind of consenting to idolatry, and therefore the clergy and people subject to them, fearful to communicate with them, write to Cyprian and the African bishops, for counsel and help: they return answer, that they are to withdraw themselves from them, and to proceed to the election of new bishops. Hereupon the bishops of the province coming to the place where Basilides was bishop, Sabinus was elected bishop by the clergy and people, with the liking of all the bishops of the province, and ordained by them bishop in the place of Basilides. After this Basilides goeth to Rome, mis-informeth Stephen the bishop, and seeketh by his means, and the help of his bishops, to recover his place again. They communicate with him, and do, as much as in them lieth, restore him to his former place and dignity again. Cyprian condemneth the false and ill dealing of Basilides, and reproveth also the negligence of Stephen, that suffered himself so easily to be misled, taxing him and such as consented with him for communicating with such wicked ones, and showing that they are partakers of their sins, and that they violate the canon of the Church, which the bishops of Africa, and all the bishops of the world, yea even Cornelius the predecessor of this Stephen, had consented on: to wit, that men so defiled with idolatry as Martialis and Basilides were should be received to penitency, but be kept from all ecclesiastical honour. Hereupon he exhorteth the brethren not to be moved, if in these last times the faith of some men be shaken, or the fear of God fail in them, or if they hold not peaceable concord with their brethren: for that both the apostle and the Lord himself foretold that such things should come to pass in the last times, the world decaying, and antichrist's revelation drawing on: and comforteth and encourageth them to hold on in the good course they were in, for that the vigour of the gospel, and the strength of Christian virtue and faith, do not so wholly fall away in these last times, *ut non supersit portio sacerdotum, que minime ad has rerum ruinas et fidei naufragia succumbat*: that is, "that no remnant of bishops should remain which should no way sink or fall in these overthrows of things, and shipwrecks of faith, but full of the fear of God, courageously maintain the honour

of the Divine Majesty, and the dignity of the priests." "We know," saith he¹, "that when the rest yielded, Mattathias valiantly maintained the law of God; and that Elias stood and strove zealously, when others forsook the law of his God. Wherefore let them that either violate the canons, or treacherously behave themselves, look to it: there are many who still retain a sincere and good mind. What if some have fallen away from the faith? doth their infidelity make the truth of God of none effect? God forbid. For God is true, and every man a liar; and if every man be a liar, and God only true, what should the servants and priests of God do, but leave the errors and lies of men, and keep the precepts of the Lord, and remain in the truth of God? Wherefore, though some of our brethren and colleagues think they may neglect the discipline of God, and rashly communicate with Basilides and Martialis; let it not trouble nor shake our faith, seeing the Spirit of God threateneth in the Psalms, saying, 'Thou hast hated discipline, and cast my words behind thy back. If thou sawest a thief,

¹ "Meminimus et tenemus, succumbentibus licet et cedentibus cæteris, Mattathiam legem Dei vindicasse fortiter: Heliam Judæis deficientibus atque a religione Divina recedentibus stetisse et certasse sublimiter: Daniele nec solitudine religionis alienæ, nec persecutionis assiduæ infestatione deterritum frequenter ac fortiter gloriosa edidisse martyria: tres item pueros nec annis nec minis fractos, contra ignes Babylonios fideliter obstitisse, et victorem regem in ipsa captivitate vicisse. Viderit vel prævaricatorum numerus vel proditorum qui nunc in ecclesia contra ecclesiam surgere et fidem pariter ac veritatem laquefactare cœperunt. Permanet apud plurimos sincera mens et religio integra, et non nisi Domino et Deo suo anima devota, nec Christianam fidem aliena perfidia deprimit ad ruinam, sed magis excitat et exaltat ad gloriam, secundum quod beatus apostolus Paulus hortatur, et dicit. [Rom. iii. 3.] 'Quid enim si exciderunt a fide quidam eorum? nunquid infidelitas eorum fidem Dei evacuavit? Absit. Est enim Deus verax, omnis autem homo mendax.' Si autem omnis homo mendax est, et solus Deus verax, quid aliud servi et maxime sacerdotes Dei facere debemus, nisi ut humanos errores et mendacia relinquamus, et præcepta dominica custodientes in Dei veritate maneamus? Quare etsi aliqui de collegis nostris extiterunt, fratres dilectissimi, qui deificam disciplinam negligendam putant, et cum Basilide et Martiali temere communicant, conturbare fidem nostram res ista non debet, cum Spiritus Sanctus in Psalmis talibus comminetur, dicens, 'Tu autem odisti disciplinam, et abjecisti sermones meos retro: si videbas furem concurrebas ei, et cum adulteris portionem tuam ponebas.'"—[Cyprian. Ibid. p. 174.]

thou rannest with him, and hadst thy portion with the adulterers.' ” These are the circumstances of Cyprian's epistle, wherein he relateth the proceedings against Basilides and Martialis, and the inconsiderate course held by the bishop of Rome, hastily communicating with them: whereby we may see how wisely and advisedly our adversaries allege Cyprian to prove, that in ancient times the bishops of Rome had power to restore such bishops to their places again as were deposed by other. For thus they must reason from this place of Cyprian, if they will make any use of it: Basilides and Martialis justly put from their office and dignity, and others rightly and in due sort chosen into their places, fly to Stephen, bishop of Rome, hoping by his means to procure the reversing of that which was done against them. He, with such as adhered to him, though they could not restore them to their places, yet communicated with them. Cyprian offended herewith, chargeth Basilides and Martialis with execrable wickedness, for abusing Stephen, and misinforming him; and Stephen with intolerable negligence and unexcusable violation of the canons, for partaking with such wicked persons; and wisheth all his brethren and colleagues constantly to hold on their course against them, notwithstanding the failing of Stephen and his adherents. Therefore the ancient bishops of Rome restored to their places such as were judicially deposed by others, and were thought by the fathers to have power and authority so to do. Which kind of reasoning, I think, the reader will not much like of.

Touching Athanasius¹ bishop of Alexandria, Paul bishop of Constantinople, and Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, deposed by the oriental synod, their complaints to the bishop of Rome, and other bishops of the West, of the wrongs done unto them; how the bishop of Rome with the western bishops sought to relieve them, with how ill success, and how little this instance serveth to prove the thing in question, I have showed before²; as likewise Theodoret's desiring Leo, with his western synods, to take knowledge of his cause. So that it is a vain brag of Bellarmine, that to these, and the like testimonies of antiquity, nothing is, nor can be answered.

¹ “Deinde Athanasium Alexandrinum, Paulum Constantinopolitanum, et Marcellum Ancyranum episcopos a synodo orientali depositos Julius I. restituit.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² Supra, cap. 35, [p. 314, 5.]

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

OF THE WEAKNESS OF SUCH PROOFS OF THE SUPREME POWER OF POPES, AS ARE TAKEN FROM THEIR LAWS, CENSURES, DISPENSATIONS, AND THE VICEGERENTS THEY HAD IN PLACES FAR REMOTE FROM THEM.

HAVING examined the pretended proofs of the illimited universality of the pope's authority and jurisdiction, taken from the power they are supposed to have exercised in former times over other bishops, by confirming, deposing, or restoring them; let us come to their laws, dispensations, and censures, and see if from thence anything may be concluded. If they could as strongly prove, as they confidently undertake, that popes in ancient times made laws to bind the whole Christian Church, dispensed with such as were made by general councils, and censured all men as subject to them of necessity, we must be forced to acknowledge the fulness of all power to rest in the Roman bishops. But their proofs are too weak to make us believe any such thing. For first, touching the decrees of popes, they did not bind the whole Christian Church, but the western provinces only that were subject to them as patriarchs of the West. And secondly, they were not made by them without the consent and joint concurrence of the other bishops of the West, assembled in synods, and sitting with them as their fellow-judges, with equal power of defining and determining things concerning the state of the Church: as appeareth by the decrees of Gregory the First¹, who sitting in council with all the bishops of the Roman Church, (the deacons and inferior clergymen standing before them) made decrees, and confirmed them by their subscriptions, the rest of the bishops and the presbyters also who sat in council with them subscribing in the very same sort that Gregory did. And of decrees in such sort made, Leo speaketh², when he requireth

¹ "Gregorius papa coram sanctissimo beati Petri corpore cum episcopis omnibus ac Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyteris residens, adstantibus diaconibus et cuncto clero, dixit, &c."—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. lxxxviii. [Al. xliv. Append. Tom. ii. col. 1288. Par. 1705.]

² "Hoc itaque admonitio nostra denuntiat quod si quis fratrum contra hæc constituta venire tentaverit, et prohibita fuerit ausus admittere, a suo se noverit officio submovendum, nec communionis nostræ futurum esse consortem qui socius esse noluit disciplinæ. Ne quid

the bishops of Campania, Picene, and Thuscia, to keep and observe the decretal constitutions of Innocentius, and all other his predecessors, which they had ordained as well touching ecclesiastical orders, as the discipline of the canons, or otherwise to look for no favour or pardon. And in the very same sort are the words of Hilarius¹ to be understood, when he saith, "That no man may violate either the divine constitutions, or the decrees of the apostolic see, without danger of losing his place." For this he spake sitting as president in a council of bishops assembled at Rome, of things decreed by synods of bishops, wherein his predecessors were presidents and moderators, as he was now, but not absolute commanders. But Bellarmine² saith, that "pope Anastasius the younger, in his Epistle to Anastasius the emperor, willeth him not to resist the apostolical precepts, but obediently to perform what by the Church of Rome and apostolical authority shall be prescribed unto him, if he desire to hold communion with the same holy Church of God, which is his head. Therefore the pope had power to command and give laws to the emperor, and consequently had an absolute supreme authority in the Church." Surely this allegation of the cardinal is like the rest. For Anastasius doth not speak in any such peremptory and threatening manner to the emperor, but acknowledging his breast to be a sanctuary of happiness, and that he is God's vicar on earth, telleth him in modest and humble sort, that he hopeth he will not suffer the insolency of those of Constantinople proudly to resist against the evangelical and apostolical precepts in the cause of Acatius, but that he will force them to perform

vero sit quod prætermisum a nobis forte credatur, omnia decretalia constituta tam beatæ recordationis Innocentii quam omnium decessorum nostrorum quæ de ecclesiasticis ordinibus et canonum promulgata sunt disciplinis, ita a vestra dilectione custodiri debere mandamus ut si quis in illa commiserit veniam sibi deinceps noverit denegari."—Leo. Epist. i. [Al. Epist. iv. Tom. i. col. 616.]

¹ "Nulli fas sit sine status sui periculo vel divinas constitutiones vel apostolicæ sedis decreta temerare."—Hilarius, citat. a Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. Cap. 19. [Tom. i. p. 329.]

² "Anastasius junior papa in epist. ad Anastas. Aug. 'Præceptis,' inquit, 'apostolicis non dura superbia resistatur, sed per obedientiam quæ a S. Romana ecclesia et apostolica auctoritate jussa sunt salubriter impleantur, si ejusdem sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ quæ est caput vestrum communionem habere desideratis.'"—Bellarm. [Ibid.]

and do what is fit, and in like humble sort beseecheth him, when he shall understand the cause of them of Alexandria, to force them to return to the unity of the Church. The last instance of the pope's lawgiving power, brought by Bellarmine, is the privilege granted to the monastery of St Medardus, by Gregory the First¹; in the end whereof we find these words: "Whatsoever kings, bishops, judges, or secular persons, shall violate the decrees of this apostolical authority, and our commandment, shall be deprived of their honour, driven from the society of Christians, put from the communion of the Lord's body and blood, and subjected to anathema, and all the woful curses that infidels and heretics have been subject to from the beginning of the world to this present time." A strong confirmation of the privileges granted is found in these words, but a weak confirmation of the thing in question: for the privileges were granted and confirmed in this sort, not by Gregory alone out of the fulness of his power, but by the consenting voice of all the bishops of Italy and France, by the authority of the senate of Rome, by Theodoricus the king, and Brunichildis the queen. So that from hence no proof possibly can be drawn of the pope's absolute power of making laws by himself alone, to bind any part of the Christian Church, much less the whole Christian world.

Wherefore let us pass from the pope's power of making laws, to see by what right they claim authority to dispense with the laws of the Church, and the canons of general councils. The first that is alleged to have dispensed with the canons of councils is Gelasius². But this allegation is idle,

¹ "Si quis regum antistitum judicium vel quarumcumque secularium personarum hujus apostolicæ auctoritatis et nostræ præceptionis decreta violaverit, aut contradixerit, aut negligenter duxerit, vel fratres inquietaverit, vel conturbaverit, vel aliter ordinaverit, cujuscumque dignitatis vel sublimitatis sit honore suo privetur, et ut catholicæ fidei depravator, vel sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ destructor, a consortio Christianitatis, et corpore ac sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi sequestretur, et omnium maledictionum anathemate quibus infideles et hæretici ab initio seculi usque in præsens damnati sunt, cum Juda traditore domini, in inferno inferiori damnetur, nisi digna pœnitentia præfatorum sanctorum sibi propitiaverit clementiam et fratrum communem reconciliaverit concordiam."—Greg. Ad finem epist. [Tom. II. Append. col. 1287.]

² "De dispensationibus exemplum habemus in epist. i. Gelasii, (nam recentiora infinita de industria prætermittimus), 'Necessaria,'

and to no purpose. For first, it cannot be proved, that by dispensing he sought to free any from the necessity of doing that the strictness of the canon required, but those only that were subject to him as patriarch of the West. And secondly, he did not dispense but upon very urgent cause, and driven by necessity so to do; and yet not of himself alone, but with the concurrence of other bishops of the West, assembled in synod. The other instances that are brought of the dispensations of Gregory the First¹ are nothing else but the instances of the ill consciences of them that bring them. For Gregory did not dispense with the English to marry within the degrees prohibited, (as the cardinal untruly reporteth) but only advised Austin² not to put them that were newly converted from such wives as they had married within some of the degrees prohibited, in the time of their infidelity, lest he might seem to punish them for faults committed in the days of their ignorance, and to discourage other from becoming Christians. Neither did he dispense with them of Sicilia for the not keeping of the canon of the Nicene council, requiring provincial synods to be holden twice every year³; but whereas they held

inquit, 'rerum dispositione conjungimur, et apostolicæ sedis modamine convenimur, sic canonum paternorum decreta librare et retro præsulum decessorumque nostrorum præcepta metiri, ut quæ præsentiam necessitas temporum restaurandis ecclesiis relaxanda deposcit, adhibita consideratione diligenti quantum potest fieri, temperemus,' et ibidem in multis dispensat.—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

¹ "Item Gregorius, Lib. XII. Epist. xxxi. Felici episcopo Siciliæ dicit, se dispensasse cum Anglis circa matrimonia in gradibus prohibitis; et rursum cum Siculis, ut semel tantum in anno concilium celebrent; cum alioquin regulæ præcipiant bis in anno concilia celebrari. Porro regula ista in qua Gregorius dispensabat, est can. 5. Concil. i. Generalis."—Bellarm. [Ibid.]

² "Quia multi sunt in Anglorum gente qui dum adhuc in infidelitate essent huic nefando conjugio dicuntur admixti, ad fidem venientes admonendi sunt ut se abstineant, et grave hoc peccatum esse cognoscant. . . . Non tamen pro hac re corporis ac sanguinis Domini communione privandi sunt, ne in eis illa ulcisci videamur in quibus se per ignorantiam ante lavacrum baptismatis adstrinxerunt."—Greg. Lib. XII. Epist. xxxi. [Al. Lib. XI. Epist. lxiv. Tom. II. col. 1155.]

³ "Illud quoque fieri debere perspeximus ut semel per annum ad Syracusanam sive Catanensium civitatem universaliter honore quo dignum est, sicut eidem jussimus, fraternitas vestra conveniat."—[Lib. I. Epist. i. col. 486.]

not such councils so much as once in the year, he commanded that they should not fail to meet in council once at the least every year, seeing the canons require that these meetings should be twice. These truly are very weak and insufficient proofs of the papal power in dispensing with the laws of the Church, and the canons of general councils: and yet these are the best, nay, these are all that they can make show to bring out of all antiquity.

Let us therefore proceed to the censures that the ancient bishops of Rome are reported to have exercised, and see if they prove the universality of power now claimed. The first allegation to this purpose, is the intent of Victor, bishop of Rome¹, resolving to have rejected from his communion all the churches of Asia, for keeping the feast of Easter on the same day the Jews did. "For," saith Bellarmine², "howsoever Irenæus and others dissuaded him from executing that he intended, yet it appeareth his observation was right, in that it was afterwards confirmed by the Nicene council, and that he had authority over all, in that he went about to excommunicate those of Asia for dissenting from him in the observation of that feast, and keeping it with the Jews, though he were content, for the avoiding of some inconveniences, at the intreaty of Irenæus, to forbear proceeding against them." For answer hereunto we must observe, that by reason of the custom of those of Asia, that kept the feast of Easter precisely at the same time the Jews did, there was moved not a little contention throughout the whole world, and many synods in every place called. For in Palestine³ a synod was

¹ "Ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ μὲν τῆς Ῥωμαίων προεστὼς Βίκτωρ ἀθρόως τῆς Ἀσίας πάσης ἅμα ταῖς ὁμόροις ἐκκλησίαις τὰς παροικίας ἀποτέμνειν, ὡς ἑτεροδοξούσας, τῆς κοινῆς ἐνώσεως πειρᾶται, καὶ στηλιτεύει γε διὰ γραμμάτων ἀκοινωνήτους πάντας ἄρδην τοὺς ἐκείσε ἀνακηρύττων ἀδελφούς."—Euseb. H. E. v. 24.

² "Respondeo quod Irenæus et multi alii Victorem objurgaverint quod tantas ecclesias levi de causa, ut ipsis videbatur, a corporis ecclesiastici unitate præcidisset, testatur Eusebius ibidem; at quod Victor sententiam suam mutaverit nusquam legimus.... Est autem hic observandum quod licet Irenæus et alii tunc putaverint imprudenter egisse Victorem; tamen revera prudentissime egit, ut postea tota ecclesia judicavit."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 19. [Tom. I. p. 330.]

³ "Φέρεται δ' εἰσέτι νῦν τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην τηνικάδε συγκεκροτημένων γραφῇ, ὧν προϋτέτακτο Θεόφιλος τῆς ἐν Καισαρείᾳ παροικίας ἐπίσκοπος,

holden, whereof Theophilus of Cæsarea, and Narcissus of Jerusalem, were presidents; another at Rome, whereof Victor was president; and another, of the bishops of Pontus, whereof Palmas, as most ancient, was president: and in sundry other places other synods were called. But the synod of the bishops in Asia, whereof Polycrates was president, stiffly maintained the ancient custom that had long prevailed in those parts, and wrote an Epistle to Victor, and those of the Roman Church, to justify themselves in this behalf. Victor and his bishops, much offended with this their pertinacy (as they construed it), would for this cause have rejected them from their communion. But Irenæus, with some other of a milder spirit, and better temper, stayed them from such rash and violent proceedings; and Irenæus wrote his letters to this purpose to the bishop of Rome, and other his colleagues: so that here is nothing to prove the power of the pope. For what was resolved on, both touching the right of the observation, and the proceedings against them that disliked it, was resolved by the synods of bishops, and not by Victor alone: as likewise Irenæus was not alone, but many other joined with him in the reprehension of Victor, whose number and multitude prevailed much with him, and stayed his proceedings as well as the persuasions of Irenæus. And yet did not the western bishops take upon them to excommunicate those of Asia, as the cardinal untruly affirmeth, but only to reject them from their communion and fellowship; there being a very great difference between excommunication properly so named, and the rejecting of men from our communion of fellowship. For excommunication properly so named is a resolution to deny the sacraments to such as are to receive them of us, the abandoning of all fellowship with them, and the requiring and commanding of others to refrain from all communicating with them in private or public; and argueth him that so excommunicateth, to be superior in authority and

καὶ Νάρκισσος τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης δὲ ὁμοίως ἄλλη περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ζητήματος, ἐπίσκοπον Βικτόρα δηλοῦσα· τῶν τε κατὰ Πόντον ἐπισκόπων, ὧν Πάλμας ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προϋτέτακτο, καὶ τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν δὲ παροικίων ἅς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει· ἔτι τε τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ὀσροηνὴν καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖσε πόλεις· καὶ ἰδίως Βακχύλλου, τῆς Κορινθίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου, καὶ πλείστων ὄσων ἄλλων, οἱ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν δόξαν τε καὶ κρίσιν ἐξηγε- νεγμένοι τὴν αὐτὴν τέθεινται ψῆφον.”—Euseb. H. E. v. 23.

greater in place than they are whom he excommunicateth. But rejecting from communion, or refusing to communicate with men, may be found among them that are equal. So Cyril¹ wrote to Nestorius, that if he revoked not certain dangerous positions, he would communicate no longer with him. So the bishops of the East² told Julius bishop of Rome, that if he communicated with Athanasius they would no longer communicate with him. And such was the proceeding that Victor intended against those of Asia; and therefore proveth not that he was their superior, or had a commanding authority over them. And yet surely, howsoever it be true, that his manner of observation was better than theirs, whom he disliked, his intention upon such an occasion to have made a breach in the Christian Churches, was justly with some bitterness reprehended by Irenæus and his brethren. For howsoever Bellarmine³ would make the reader believe by alleging that of Blastus, who urged the keeping of Easter with the Jews, and sought to bring in Judaism, that Victor had reason to be violent as he was, as perceiving some ill meaning in them that held the Jewish observation; yet far be it from us to think that Polycarpus, and so many worthy and holy men as anciently kept that observation, were any way inclinable to Judaism. But this difference may be thought to have grown not from any diversity of judgment touching matters of faith, but for that in some places they thought it fit to keep this feast on the Lord's day, for very important reasons moving them so to do; and in other places, though they could

¹ “Εἰ μὴ δράσειεν ἡ σὴ εὐλαβεία κατὰ τὴν ὑρισθείσαν προθεσμίαν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι τοῦ μνημονευθέντος ὀσιωτάτου καὶ θεοσεβεστάτου ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν τοῦ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου Κελεστίνου, γίνωσκε σαυτὸν οὐδένα κλῆρον ἔχοντα μεθ’ ἡμῶν, οὐδὲ τόπον ἢ λόγον ἐν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐπισκόποις.”—In Concil. Ephes. Tom. i. cap. 14. [Labbe, cap. 26. Tom. III. col. 946.]

² Sozom. Lib. III. Cap. 7.

³ “Unus ex præcipuis auctoribus illius sententiæ de Paschate cum Judæis celebrando fuit Blastus, qui eo modo paulatim Judaismum introducere volebat, ut scribit Tertullianus de præscrip. in fine [cap. liii.] ‘Blastus,’ inquit, ‘latenter Judaismum vult introducere, Pascha enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse nisi secundum legem Mosis, decima quarta die mensis.’ Hic autem Blastus Romæ hæresim suam seminare cœpit tempore Victoris papæ, ut Eusebius testatur. Lib. v. Hist. cap. 15.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

have been content to have done so likewise upon the same reasons, yet kept they it after the old manner, for the avoiding of the scandal of the Jews, for the easier winning of them that were not yet gained to Christianity, and the holding of them in the love and liking of Christian profession that were already of Jews become Christians. The next instance is of Innocentius the First¹, who after that he heard of the death of Chrysostom, whom Theophilus had deposed, and the emperor Arcadius banished, excommunicated the emperor and empress, and anathematized Theophilus in such sort that he should utterly be excluded, and have no place among Christians. But this report may very justly be doubted of, the credit thereof resting only on the authority of Nicephorus; seeing the ancient historians² that report the proceedings of Theophilus and Arcadius against Chrysostom, and his complaints to the bishop of Rome, and other bishops of the West, of the wrongs that had been done unto him, report also the answer of the Roman bishop to have been, that he greatly pitied his case, but saw no hope of remedy, nor means to relieve him, unless a general council might be called, to which purpose he would do his best with the emperor; and that Chrysostom himself wished him not to proceed so far as to reject them from his communion that were his adversaries, for fear of further inconveniences; this being the contention almost of the whole world, and the Churches by occasion hereof everywhere brought upon their knees. Yea, all ancient historians are silent, and say nothing of this excommunication, but report the repulse³ which the messengers, the Roman bishop sent to the emperor to procure a council, received; and Theophilus⁴ (for ought I know) was ever holden a catholic

¹ "De censuris plurima essent exempla et quidem antiquissima. Nam Innocentius I. cum audivisset mortuum esse Chrysostomum, excommunicavit Imperatorem Arcadium et Eudoxiam uxorem ejus, qui non permiserant restitui Chrysostomum in suam sedem, ut ipse Innocentius jusserrat. Exstat de hac re epistola Innocentii apud Nicephorum. Lib. III. cap. 34."—[Id. Ibid.]

² Vide supra, Cap. 35. [p. 307].

³ Sozom. Lib. VIII. Cap. 18.

⁴ Theodoret, speaking of the injury done to Chrysostom, hath these words: "Alias virtutes authorum illius revereri cogor: qua de causa annitar, ut ipsorum nomina occultem."—Lib. v. Hist. Eccl. Cap. 34.

bishop, both by Hierome¹ and others to his dying day; notwithstanding these quarrels between him and Chrysostom. The excommunication of Leo the emperor, by Gregory the Third, whereof Zonaras writeth in the life of Leo Isaurus (which is a third instance of papal censures against the great men of the world), proveth not the matter in question. For Gregory did not anathematize Leo of himself alone, but with a synod of bishops; neither was he able by his own authority to stay the tribute that was wont to be paid to the emperor, but by his solicitation procured a confederacy of the French and Germans against the emperors of Constantinople, and by their means stayed the tribute that was wont to be paid; whereupon the Germans and French possessed Rome, and became lords of it. The last example is that of Nicholas the First², excommunicating Lotharius king of France, and his concubine Valdrada, together with the archbishops of Coleyn and Trevers. But the answer hereunto is easy. For first, this example proveth not the thing in question, to wit, that the pope hath an universal power over all the world, seeing all these were within the patriarchship of the bishop of Rome. And secondly we say, these circumstances of this proceeding are untruly reported by Bellarmine. For this is the true report which we find in Rhegino and others. Lotharius king of Lorraine, falling in love with Valdrada, which had been his concubine while he was yet a young man in his father's house, began to dislike Thietberga his wife. Hereupon he laboureth with the bishops of Trevers and Coleyn to find some means to put her away. They call a synod, wherein Thietberga is charged to have committed incest with her own brother, and thereupon pronounced an unfit wife for the king. The king thus freed from his wife, professeth he cannot live single; they pronounce it lawful for him to marry another

¹ Hierome wrote sundry epistles to Theophilus, full of all due respects, and turned his three Paschal books into Latin. Vide Epist. Hieron. Tom. II. [Epist. xcix. Tom. I. col. 603. Vid. etiam epist. Lxiii, Lxxxii, Lxxxvi, Lxxxviii.]

² "Nicolaus I. excommunicationem minatus est Lothario regi, et re ipsa excommunicavit concubinam ejus Valdradam, necnon archiepiscopos Coloniensem et Treverensem."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

Rhegino. Chron. Lib. II. [Ann. 864. In Rer. German. Script. Pistorii, Tom. I p. 64.] Otho Frisingens. Chron. Lib. VI. cap. 3. [p. 110. Bas. 1569.] Sigebert. Chron. Ann. 862. [Apud Pistor. ut supra. p. 795.]

wife, and he taketh Valdrada to wife whom he had formerly kept as his concubine. Nicholas the First, bishop of Rome, hearing of this, sendeth into France to learn the certainty. The legates he sendeth come to the king to expostulate the matter with him. The king answereth, that he did nothing but what the bishops of his kingdon in a general council had assured him was lawful to be done. Whereupon the bishops of Coleyn and Trevers were sent for to Rome, and the pope called a council, in which the opinions and proceedings of these bishops were condemned, and they degraded by all the bishops, presbyters and deacons, that were assembled in council. In all which narration there is no circumstance found that any way proveth the pope to have the fulness of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction: but the contrary rather may from hence be concluded, because nothing is done against these two bishops, but by a synod of bishops assembled by their own patriarch. "But," saith Bellarmine, "Pope Nicholas excommunicated the king, and Valdrada his supposed wife; therefore he is universal bishop." The former part of this saying is most untrue; for the pope did not excommunicate the king, but Valdrada only. And I think the excommunicating of one silly harlot, that had so grievously scandalized the Church of God, and whose cause was judged before in a synod, being brought thither, and there examined, by reason of the unjust proceedings of the bishops of Coleyn and Trevers against a lawful queen, in favour of her, will never by any good consequence prove the pope to be universal bishop; and yet these are all the proofs the cardinal can bring from the censures the ancient bishops of Rome are reported to have used: and therefore he proceedeth¹ to show and demonstrate the amplitude of the pope's illimited power and jurisdiction by the vicegerents he appointed in all parts of the Christian world, that were far remote from him, to do things in his name, and by his authority.

But for answer hereunto, we say, that neither this cardinal, nor any other can prove, that the bishops of Rome had any such vicars, vicegerents, or substitutes, but only within the

¹ "Argumentum octavum ex eo sumitur quod summus pontifex vicarios suos in variis regionibus aut ordinarie aut ad tempus habebat, cum reservatione tamen majorum causarum."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 20. [p. 330.]

compass of their own patriarchships: and that therefore from the having of them, nothing can be inferred for confirmation of their illimited power and authority. So Leo (as we read in his epistles¹) constituted Anastasius bishop of Thessalonica his vicegerent for the parts thereabouts, as other his predecessors had done former bishops of that Church. Which causing great resort thither upon divers occasions, may be thought to have been the reason why the council of Sardica² provideth that the clergymen of other Churches shall not make too long stay at Thessalonica. So the same Leo³ made Potentius the bishop his vicegerent in the parts of Africa; Hormisda⁴, Salustius bishop of Hispalis, in Boetica and Lusitania; and Gregory⁵, Virgilius bishop of Arles, in the regions of France: all these places being within the compass of the patriarchship of Rome, as Cusanus⁶ sheweth. And the same may be said of the bishop of Justiniana the first, who was appointed the bishop of Rome's vicegerent in those parts⁷,

¹ "Sicut prædecessores mei prædecessoribus tuis, ita etiam ego dilectioni tuæ priorum secutus exemplum, vices mei moderaminis delegavi."—Leo, Epist. lxxxiv. Ad Anastas. [Al. xiv. Tom. i. col. 683.]

² "Πολλάκις εἰς αὐτὴν [τὴν Θεσσαλονίκην] ἀπὸ ἐτέρων ἐπαρχίων πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι παραγίνονται....οὗτοι οἱ ὅροι οἱ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὀρισμένοι φυλαττέσθωσαν καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν προσώπων."—Concil. Sardic. Can. 16. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 669.]

³ "Vicem curæ nostræ proficiscenti a nobis fratri et consacerdoti nostro Potentio delegamus."—Leo, Epist. lxxxvii. [Al. xii. Tom. i. col. 658.]

⁴ "Vices nostras per Boeticam Lusitaniam que provincias, salvis privilegiis quæ metropolitanis episcopis decrevit antiquitas, præsentī tibi auctoritate committimus."—Hormisd. Epist. ad Salust. [Epist. xxvi. Labbe, Tom. v. col. 605.]

⁵ "Opportunum esse perspeximus in ecclesiis quæ sub regno præcedentissimi filii nostri Childeberti regis sunt, secundum antiquam consuetudinem, fratri nostro Virgilio Arelatensis civitatis episcopo vices nostras tribuere."—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. lii. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. liv. Tom. ii. col. 784.]

⁶ "Africa patriarchatui subest Romano, 11 Dist. 'Quis nesciat;' ubi enumerantur provinciæ Romanæ sedi subjectæ.

"Et 93 Dist. 'Juxta,' ubi dicit; 'Omnes episcopi qui ordinationibus apostolicæ sedis subjacent.'"—Nicol. De Cusa, De Concord. Cathol. Lib. ii. cap. 7. [p. 719. Bas. 1565. ex Gratiani Decreto. Dist. xi. cap. 11. et Dist. xciii. cap. 4. coll. 49, 557.]

⁷ "Per tempus autem beatissimum primæ Justinianæ nostræ patriæ archiepiscopum habere semper sub sua jurisdictione episcopos pro-

upon signification of the emperor's will and desire that it should be so. Neither doth the cardinal prove any other thing, whatsoever he maketh show of. For though Cyril bishop of Alexandria were the vicegerent of Cœlestinus, in the cause of Nestorius bishop of Constantinople, yet was he not his vicegerent in such sort as they were that were within his own patriarchship, as if he had had none authority of his own, but that only which Cœlestinus gave unto him. But Cœlestinus¹ having been informed by Cyril of the impieties of Nestorius, and having in his synods of the West condemned the same, joined his authority with the authority of Cyril, that so he might proceed against him, not only as of himself and out of the judgments of his own bishops, but also out of the consenting resolutions of them of the West. And therefore Evagrius² sheweth, that at or before the time appointed

vinciarum Daciæ, . . . et in subjectis sibi provinciis locum obtinere eum sedis apostolicæ Romæ, secundum ea quæ definita sunt a sanctissimo papa Vigilio.—Justinian. Auth. Collat. ix. Tit. 14. Siv. Novell. 131. [Cap. 3. Ad calc. Gothofred. Corp. Jur. Civil. p. 184. Amst. 1663.]

¹ “Συναφθείσης σοι τοίνυν τῆς αὐθεντίας τοῦ ἡμετέρου θρόνου, καὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ τοῦ τόπου διαδοχῇ ἐπ’ ἐξουσία χρησάμενος ταύτην ἐκβιβάσεις ἀκριβεῖ στερεώρῳ τὴν ἀπόφασιν, ἵνα ἡ ἐντὸς δέκα ἡμέρων, ἀριθμουμένων ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ὑπομνήσεως ταύτης, τὰ κακὰ κηρύγματα ἑαυτοῦ ἐγγράφῳ ὁμολογία ἀθετήσῃ, καὶ ἑαυτὸν διαβεβαιώσῃται ταύτην κατέχειν τὴν πίστιν περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἣν καὶ ἡ Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἡ τῆς σῆς ἀγιότητος ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἡ καθόλου καθοσίωσις κατέχει, ἡ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσῃ, εὐθὺς ἡ σὴ ἀγιότης ἐκείνης τῆς ἐκκλησίας προνοησαμένη μάθῃ αὐτὸν παντὶ τρόπῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωματίου ἀποκινητέον τυγχάνειν.”—Epist. Cœlestin. ad Cyrill. Concil. Ephes. Lib. i. cap. 16. [Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 897.]

“Ἰδοὺ τοίνυν ἅμα τῇ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ τῇ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην Ῥώμην συνειλεγμένη, προεδρεύοντος τοῦ ὀσιωτάτου καὶ θεοσεβεστάτου ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν Κελεστίνου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, καὶ τρίτῳ σοι τούτῳ διαμαρτυρόμεθα γράμματι, συμβουλευόντες ἀπόσχεσθαι μὲν τῶν οὕτω σκαιῶν καὶ διεστραμμένων δογμάτων.”—Epist. Cyrilli ad Nestor. [Labbe, col. 945.]

² “Νεστόριος μὲν οὐ μακρὰν τῆς Ἐφέσου διεστώσης τῆς Κωνσταντίνου φθάνει πάντως. Καὶ Κύριλλος δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν πρὸ τῆς ἐπαγγελθείσης ἡμέρας ἀπηντήκασιν. Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ τῆς Ἀντιοχείων πρόεδρος σὺν τοῖς ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν ἀπελείφθη τῆς ὀρισθείσης ἡμέρας. . . . Ὡς οὖν ἡ κυρία παρώχηκεν ἡμέρας πεντεκαίδεκα οἱ ἐπὶ τοῦτο συναθροισθέντες, ὥς οὐ φθησομένων τῶν ἀνατολικῶν, ἡ εἰ καὶ φθαῖεν μετὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου τριβὴν ἀλίσκονται, Κυρίλλου τοῦ θεσπεσίου διέποντος καὶ τὸν Κελεστίνου τόπον τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν, ὥς εἴρηται, τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης πρυτανεύοντος· καλοῦσι δ’ οὖν καὶ τὸν Νεστόριον,

by the emperor, Nestorius and Cyril came to Ephesus, where a council was to be holden: and that John of Antioch with his bishops being not come, after fifteen days' stay, Cyril bishop of Alexandria, the greatest of all the bishops that were present (who also supplied the place of Cœlestinus), with the rest of the bishops, thought good to send for Nestorius, and to require him to appear in the synod, to answer to the crimes objected to him. Whereby it is evident, that (Nestorius being to be judged in a general council) Cyril being the greatest of the bishops that were present, (the bishop of Rome neither coming nor sending at the first) was in his own right president of that assembly¹. But the bishop of Rome, who could not come, (but having assembled his bishops in the West, had judged and condemned him,) joined his authority with Cyril, the principal of the bishops that were present, that so nothing might be wanting to the perfection of a general council. So that it is most certain, that Cyril was president of the council of Ephesus, not as a vicegerent only to the bishop of Rome, but in his own right, though he had the authority, direction, and consenting concurrence of the bishop of Rome, and all the western bishops, joined with the power and authority which he and the rest of the bishops present had of themselves. And therefore Leo² saith in express words, that Cyril was president of the council of Ephesus, as likewise Photius³ and others affirm. The same answer may serve for Acacius⁴. For he was not vicegerent

προτρέποντες τοῖς ἐπαγομένοις ἀπολογήσασθαι.—Evagr. H. E. Lib. i. cap. 3, 4.

¹ Relat. sanctæ Synodi ad pientiss. Imp. inter Epist. Synodales vocat Cyrillum caput congregatorum Episcoporum. [*Κεφαλὴς τῶν ἐπηγγελλένων ἁγιωτάτων ἀρχιεπισκόπων Κυρίλλου.*—Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1185.]

² "Prioris Ephesinæ synodi cui sanctæ memoriæ Cyrillus episcopus tunc præsedet, contra Nestorium specialiter statuta permaneant."—Leo, Epist. xlvii. [Al. xciii. Tom. i. col. 1073.]

³ "Præsides erant Cyrillus ille celeberrimus inter patres qui propter virtutem sapientiæ que divitias magnæ civitatis Alexandriæ sedem obtinebat, et Cœlestini Romani pontificis implebat sedem atque personam gerebat, et Memno," &c.—Photius de Septem Synodis. [Ad calc. Nomocanon. p. 267. Par. 1615.]

⁴ "Risimus autem quod prærogativam volunt Acacio comparari, quia episcopus fuerit regiæ civitatis.... Numquid Acacius ut Joannem qualemlibet hominem catholicum tamen a catholicis ordinatum de Alexandria excluderet, Petrum que in hæresi jam detectum atque

of the bishop of Rome, in hearing and determining the cause of Peter bishop of Alexandria, (who was an Eutychian heretic,) as having none authority of his own, but there was a joint concurrence of the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Constantinople; the latter having, besides his own right and interest, the full power and authority of the other: and being likewise to use the help of the emperor for the reducing of the Church of Alexandria to the unity of the faith again, in which business he failed; for though at first he condemned Peter bishop of Alexandria, yet afterwards he was content to communicate with him: for which cause he was justly reprehended as not answering the trust that was reposed in him, and as being a favourer of heretics, and so in a sort an heretic himself. To these allegations which we have already heard, Harding¹ in his answer to bishop Jewel's Challenge addeth another, of a bishop of Alexandria being vicegerent to the bishop of Rome, out of the epistle of Bonifacius the Second, to Eulalius or Eulabius. But Bellarmine² refuteth that epistle,

damnatum absque sedis apostolicæ consultatione reciperet aliqua synodo saltem illic habita, hoc audacter arripuit, ut Calendionem de Antiochia pelleret, hæreticum que Petrum quem ipse quoque damnaverat absque notitia sedis apostolicæ rursus admitteret, aliqua synodo id fecisse monstratur?—Gelas. Epist. xiii. Ad Episc. Dardan. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 332.]

¹ "Now that the bishop of Rome had always care and rule over all other bishops, specially of them of the East, (for touching them of the West Church it is generally confessed), beside a hundred other evident arguments, this is one very sufficient, that he had in the East to do his stead three delegates or vicars; now commonly they be named legates. And this for the commodity of the bishops there whose Churches were far distant from Rome. The one was the bishop of Constantinople, as we find it mentioned in *Epistola Simplicii ad Acacium Constantinopolitanum*. The second was the bishop of Alexandria, as the epistle of Bonifacius the Second to Eulalius recordeth. The third was the bishop of Thessalonica, as it is at large declared in the eighty-second epistle of Leo ad Anastasium Thessalonicensem."—Harding, *Apud Jewel*. [Apology, Art. 4. Vol. II. p. 246. Oxon. 1848.]

² "Respondeo primum, valde mihi eas epistolas esse suspectas; nam in primis pugnare videntur cum iis quæ diximus de conjunctione Augustini, Eugenii, Fulgentii, et aliorum Africanorum cum Romana ecclesia. Deinde Eulabius Alexandrinus, ad quem Bonifacius scribere videtur, nullus fuit, aut certe eo tempore non fuit, ut patet ex chronologia Nicephori Constantinopolitani."—Bellarm. *De Pont. Rom.* Lib. II. cap. 25. [p. 336.]

and showeth that it is counterfeit, and that there never was any such Eulabius, to whom Bonifacius might write: and therefore we will no longer insist upon the examination of the same, but proceed to the proofs which our adversaries bring from appeals made to Rome.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

OF APPEALS TO ROME.

FOR the clearing of the matter of appeals we must observe, that they are of three sorts: of laymen, of inferior clergymen, and of bishops. Of the appeals of laymen there is no mention in all antiquity: and yet now the bishops of Rome reserve all the greater causes even concerning the laity to themselves alone, forbidding the ordinary guides of the Church to intermeddle with them; and very ordinarily admit appeals of laymen, to the infinite vexation of men, and the great hinderance of the course of all justice. Whereas it is most wisely and rightly ordered, each bishop having his portion of the flock of Christ committed to him, as Cyprian¹ observeth, that they that are committed to their charge should not be permitted to run hither and thither, but be judged there, where the things, for which they are called in question, were done, and where the accusers and witnesses may be present.

Concerning inferior clergymen, the holy bishops in the council of Milevis² speak in this sort: "It hath seemed good unto us, that if presbyters, deacons, and other inferior clergymen, complain of the judgments of their own bishops, the

¹ "Oportet utique eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare, nec episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sua subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint."—Cyprian. Lib. i. Epist. iii. [Al. Epist. lix. p. 136.]

² "Placuit, ut presbyteri diaconi vel cæteri inferiores clerici in causis quas habuerint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini episcopi eos audiant: et inter eos quicquid est finiant adhibiti ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. Quod si et ab eis provocandum putaverint, non provocent, nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad

neighbour bishops intreated by them with the consent of their bishops shall hear them and make an end; and if they think good to appeal from their judgment, it shall not be lawful for them to appeal, but only to the councils of Africa, or to the primates of their own provinces. And if they shall make their appeal beyond the seas, no man in Africa shall receive them to the communion." This whole council Innocentius the First approved, as it appeareth by his epistle¹, which we find in the book of the epistles of St Augustine. "Hereunto," Bellarmine² saith, "some answer with Gratian³: who addeth to the canon of this council, forbidding appeals to be made beyond the seas, an exception, 'unless it be to the see apostolic.' But this exception," saith Bellarmine, "seemeth not fitting, seeing the Africans made this decree, that men should not appeal beyond the seas, especially in respect of the Church of Rome, and to restrain the making of appeals thither; there never being any appeal from the Africans to any other Church but to the Church of Rome only. And yet Stapleton⁴ answereth the authority of this council as Gratian doth, and that out of Julius and Fabianus, bishops of Rome, as he saith. "The council of Sardica⁵," saith Bellarmine, "decreed that

primates provinciarum suarum. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem accipiatur."—Concil. Milevit. Can. 22. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1542.]

¹ Inter Epist. August. Epist. xciii. [Al. clxxxii. Tom. II. col. 638, sq.]

² "Respondent aliqui cum Gratiano, qui addidit ad hunc canonem exceptionem, 'nisi forte ad apostolicam sedem appelletur.' Sed hæc exceptio non videtur quadrare, nam præcipue propter Romanam ecclesiam Africani statuerunt, ut non liceret appellare ultra mare: non enim appellari unquam consuevit ultra mare ab Africanis, nisi ad Romanam sedem. Neque opus est confugere ad has angustias exceptionis, cum solutio vera sit in promptu."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 24. [Tom. I. p. 332.]

³ Gratian. [Decret. Part. 2.] Caus. 2. Quæst. 6. cap. 'Placuit.' [col. 849.]

⁴ "Hoc totum factum est *ad peregrina judicia vitanda*, non ad Romanæ sedis auctoritatem excludendam. Aperte hoc habet Julius, et ante eum Fabianus Papa."—Stapleton. Controv. III. De Prim. subject. Potest. Eccles. Quæst. 7. Explic. Art. [Tom. I. p. 719. Par. 1620.]

⁵ "Εἰ τις διάκονος ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ καὶ τις τῶν κληρικῶν ἀκοινώνητος γένηται, καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον ἐπίσκοπον τὸν εἰδότα αὐτὸν καταφύγοι, γινώσκοντα ἀποκεκινῆσθαι αὐτὸν τῆς κοινωνίας παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, μὴ χρήναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ὕβριν ποιῶντα παρέχειν αὐτῷ κοινωνίαν. Εἰ δὲ

the causes of presbyters and inferior clergymen appealing from the judgments of their own bishops should be determined and ended by the neighbour-bishops: and pope Zosimus, as appeareth by the sixth council of Carthage, and the epistle of the same council to Bonifacius the pope, required the same canon to be revived¹." Augustine² likewise sheweth that it was not lawful for those of the clergy under the degree of bishops to appeal out of Africa. Neither was this the peculiar privilege of Africa alone. For the council of Chalcedon³ ordained, that if a clergyman have ought against another of the clergy, the matter shall be heard by the bishop, or by arbitrators chosen by both parties, with the bishop's allowance: but if he have ought against his bishop, he shall prosecute the same complaint in the synod of the province. This canon of the council of Chalcedon the emperor confirmed, saying⁴, "If any of the clergy complain against his bishop for any matter,

τολμήσοι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι γινωσκέτω συνελθόντων ἐπισκόπων ἀπολογία ἑαυτὸν ὑπεύθυνον καθιστάναι."—Concil. Sardic. Can. 17. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 668.]

¹ "Concilium Sardicense quod episcopus voluit posse appellare ad pontificem, idem voluit causas presbyterorum et minorum clericorum terminari apud vicinos episcopos; ita ut liceat minoribus clericis appellare a suo episcopo ad alios episcopos ejusdem provinciæ. Quos duo canones renovari voluit papa Zosimus, et executioni mandari in Africa, ut patet ex concilio 6 Carthag. et ex epistola ejusdem concilii ad Bonifacium Papam."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "Neque enim de presbyteris aut diaconis aut inferioris ordinis clericis, sed de collegis agebatur, qui possent aliorum collegarum judicio, præsertim ecclesiarum apostolicarum, causam suam integram reservare."—August. Epist. clxii. [Al. cxliii. Tom. II. col. 91. f.]

³ "Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχοι, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκείον ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια κατατρεχέτω, ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὴν ὑπόθεσιν γυμναζέτω παρὰ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἢ γοῦν γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου παρ' οἷς ἂν τὰ ἀμφοτέρα μέρη βούλεται τὰ τῆς δίκης συγκροτεῖσθω. Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσῃ κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις. Εἰ δέ τις κληρικὸς ἔχοι πρᾶγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω."—Concil. Chalced. Can. 9. [Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1685.]

⁴ "Si a clero aut alio quocunque aditio contra episcopum fiat propter quamlibet causam, apud sanctissimum ejus metropolitam secundum canones et leges huic præbeat finem. Si vero contra metropolitam talis aditio fiat ab episcopo aut clero aut alia quacunque persona, diœceseos illius beatissimus patriarcha simili modo causam judicet."—Justinian. Novell. cxxiii. cap. 22. [Ad calc. Gothofred. Corp. Jur. Civil. p. 173. Amst. 1663.]

let the cause be judged by the metropolitan, according to the sacred rules, and the imperial laws. And if any man appeal from his sentence, let the cause be brought to the archbishop or patriarch of that diocese, and let him, according to the canons, make a final end." And yet, notwithstanding these canons above recited precisely forbidding inferior clergymen to appeal to Rome, we find that the bishops of Rome¹ admitted the appeal of one Apiarius, judged and condemned in Africa; which caused a great difference between the Africans and him. Whereupon the fathers in the council of Africa, with the bishop of Rome (as it beseemeth him), do reject and repel the wicked and unlawful appeals, as well of presbyters, as of other inferior clergymen; seeing the ending and determining of their causes is by no decree of any synod denied to the Church of Africa, and the Nicene canons most clearly commit both inferior clergymen and bishops to their own metropolitans. Bellarmine², to clear the pope from intrusion, and to avoid the testimonies and authorities of the holy bishops and pastors of the Church, which we have produced to show the unlawfulness of appeals to Rome, answereth first, "that though they of the inferior clergy were prohibited to appeal to the pope, yet he was not forbidden to admit their appeals;" which is a most strange answer. For if they in appealing did ill, and violated the canons, he could not but offend in admitting such their appeals. And therefore they of Africa³ tell the pope, that it beseemeth him to repel such appeals; and that to admit them, is to bring in the smoky puff of worldly pride into the Church; professing that the ending of such matters belongeth to the Church of Africa, and complaining of intolerable wrongs and injuries done unto them,

¹ Ut patet ex epist. Concil. Afric. ad Cœlestin. [Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 532.]

² "Respondeo, licet prohibitum fuerit clericis inferioris ordinis appellare ab episcopis suæ provinciæ, non tamen prohibitum fuit nec prohiberi potuit summo pontifici, ne si vellet eos admitteret. Præterea Romani pontifices non tam admiserunt appellationem Apiarii quam audierunt ejus querimonias, et mandarunt Africanis ut ejus causam diligenter cognoscerent, et fideliter judicarent. Apparet enim ex illis duabus epistolis, bis Apiarium venisse Romam, et utraque vice remissum in Africam, et ibi in concilio judicatum post reditum ejus ab urbe."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

³ Ep. prædict. Conc. Afric. c. 105.

when such appeals are admitted; whence it is consequent, that the pope may not admit them. Secondly, he answereth, that the bishop of Rome admitted not the appeal of Apiarius, but heard his complaints, and commanded them of Africa more diligently to examine his cause: whereas it is most plain and evident, that the pope, upon his appeal, unadvisedly received him to his communion, and restored him to his degree and place again. Besides that to hear complaints, and to command a review, is, in the judgment of all men of sense and understanding, a kind of an admitting of an appeal; seeing no such thing can be done but by him that hath power to judge of their judgment whom he commandeth to review and re-examine that they have formerly judged.

Concerning bishops, the council of Chalcedon¹ decreed, that if a bishop have ought against the metropolitan, he shall go to the primate of the diocese, or to the see of the princely city of Constantinople, that there the matter may be examined and heard. And the emperor² confirming the same canon, decreed, that if the bishops of one synod have any matter of variance among themselves, either for ecclesiastical right, or any other occasions; first the metropolitan, and the other bishops of the synod, shall examine and determine the cause; and if either part dislike the judgment, then the patriarch of that diocese shall give them audience according to the ecclesiastical canons, and imperial laws, neither side having liberty to contradict his judgment. This decree of the emperor Gregory the First³ reciteth, and alloweth: only adding, that if there be neither metropolitan nor patriarch, then the matter

¹ “Εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίῃ, καταλαμβάνετω ἢ τὸν ἑξάρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ δικάζεσθω.”—Concil. Chalced. Can. 9. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1685.]

² “Si quis sanctissimorum episcoporum ejusdem synodi dubitationem aliquam ad invicem habeat, sive pro ecclesiastico jure sive pro aliis quibusdam rebus, prius metropolita eorum cum aliis de sua synodo episcopis causam examinet et judicet. Et si non rata habuerit utraque pars quæ judicata sunt, tunc beatissimus patriarcha dioceseos illius inter eos audiat, et illa determinet quæ ecclesiasticis canonibus et legibus consonant; nulla parte ejus sententiæ contradicere valente.”—Justinian. Novell. cxxiii. cap. 22. [Citat. Not. 4. p. 375. supra.]

³ “Contra hæc si dictum fuerit quia nec metropolitam habuit nec patriarcham, dicendum est quia a sede apostolica, quæ omnium ec-

must be ended by the apostolic see, which is the head of all Churches. So that even in his judgment, when there is a patriarch, no bishop may appeal from him to Rome, but every one is bound to stand to the end that he shall make. The eighth general council¹ in like sort appointeth bishops complaining of their metropolitans to go to the patriarch, that he may make an end, and requireth either side to stand to the end that he shall make; seeing the more honourable bishops out of sundry provinces called together by him sit in council with him. Yet Zosimus, Bonifacius, and Cœlestinus, bishops of Rome², by their agents in the councils of Africa urged and claimed a pretended right to admit appeals of bishops from any part of the world, as from the canons of the Nicene council. But the worthy bishops there present looking into the decrees of that council, and finding no such thing as was alleged, lest haply those copies of the council which they had might be defective, imperfect, or corrupted, sent to the most reverend patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, for the authentical and indubitate copies; but could find no such thing in them when they came, as was alleged by the agents of the bishop of Rome. And therefore they wrote unto him, and prayed him no more so easily to admit men coming to him with appeals and complaints, nor to receive to his communion such as they should excommunicate, because the Nicene council hath forbidden all such admission; committing not only laymen and inferior clergymen, but bishops³ also, to their own metropolitans; and requiring that bishops put from the communion in their own provinces,

clesiarum caput est, causa hæc audienda ac dirimenda fuerat.—Greg. Lib. xi. Epist. liv. [Al. Lib. xiii. Epist. xlv. Tom. ii. col. 1254.]

¹ “*Episcopos concurrere ad patriarchale caput decernimus, qui a metropolitans suis talia se pertulisse fatentur, ut apud patriarcham et metropolitans qui sub ipso sunt justam et sine suspicione sententiam quod movetur negotium accipiat.*”—Concil. Constantinop. iv. General. viii. Can. 26. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 650.]

² Epist. citat. a Conc. Afric. sive Carthag. 6.

³ The Africans, though within the patriarchship of Rome, disliked the appeals of bishops to Rome, because they might have right against their metropolitans, if they wronged them, in a general synod of Africk, wherein the primate sat as president: for otherwise bishops wronged by their metropolitans might by the canons appeal to their own patriarch.

should not be by other hastily, suddenly, or unduly restored to the communion. And farther, they besought the Roman bishops to repel, as beseemeth them, the wicked appeals of presbyters, and other inferior clergymen, because no decree of any council hath prejudiced the Church of Africa in this behalf; but all the fathers most prudently and justly decreed and determined, that all matters should be ended in the place where they arise, seeing no province can lack the grace of the Holy Ghost, whereby the bishops of Christ may be able both wisely to see, and constantly to maintain the right; and especially for that it is lawful for every one that shall mislike the judgment of them that have the hearing of his cause, to appeal to the councils of his province, or to a general council, unless haply any man will think that God will inspire the trial of justice into one man alone, and that he will deny the same to a great number of bishops assembled in council; and farther they add, that these beyond-sea judgments cannot be thought good and of force, whereunto the persons of the witnesses necessary for the finding out of the truth cannot be brought, either in respect of the infirmity of their sex or age, or by reason of some other impediment. And thus we see that the bishops of Rome could not demonstrate their right to receive appeals of bishops, refusing to stand to the judgments of their own metropolitans and synods, out of the Nicene council, but failed in the issue. Yet may we not hereupon charge them with falsification or mistaking, say the worthy proctors of the Roman Church¹: but we must rather say with counterfeit Athanasius, in his Epistle to Felix, that the copies of the Nicene council were corrupted, or, in his Epistle to Mark the bishop of Rome, that they were burned, than that we should yield any such thing. And yet surely if they were corrupted, they were not burned; and if they were burnt, they were not corrupted: and that the Arians should corrupt the copies of the Nicene council in other things, and leave it inviolable in that part that toucheth them most, and condemneth their heresy, is strange and unlikely. Bellarmine²

¹ "Quod illi canones non sint omnes probant nonnulli ex epist. Athanasii ad Marcum papam, in qua petit exemplum Nicæni concilii ex Romani pontificis scrinio, asserens exempla quæ erant Alexandriæ fuisse cremata ab Arianis."

² "Sed hoc argumentum ridetur a Magdeburgensibus, et vere non

saith: "The Magdeburgians do laugh at the report of the burning of those copies of the Nicene council that were kept at Alexandria," and seemeth to confess they have reason so to do. "For," saith he, "the supposed burning happened in the time of Constantius the emperor, when as Athanasius being driven from thence, George the Arian had gotten into his place, as Athanasius testifieth in his Epistle *ad Omnes Orthodoxos*; whereas it may be clearly proved, out of the chronicle of Hierome, that Mark the pope was dead at that time. Besides, if Mark the pope had sent the true copies to Alexandria upon this letter of Athanasius, as is pretended, why should not the copies that were found at Rome, and they that were brought from Alexandria into Africa, have agreed together? How came it to pass that the canon urged for the pope's advantage in the councils of Africa was not found in the copies sent from Alexandria, but that that copy altogether agreed with the other that came from Constantinople and Antioch?" Bellarmine therefore passing by these epistles, as being of no great credit, allegeth sundry things mentioned by the ancient, as decreed by the council of Nice, which yet are not found in those twenty canons now extant, to prove that it followeth not that the bishops of Rome falsified the council of Nice, because they could not find the things they urged in the copies sent out of the East, seeing they might be in some other, as well as those things that are mentioned by the ancient, which are not found in these twenty canons. The things alleged by him out of the ancient, as decreed by the Nicene council, which yet are not found in the canons now extant, are in number seven, whereof some were neither decreed in that council, nor reported by the ancient to have been decreed there. For Hierome¹ doth not say that the council of Nice reckoned the

est solidum. Nam illa incensio librorum accidit tempore Constantini imperatoris, quando Athanasio expulso Georgius quidam Arianus in locum ejus ordinatus est, ut ipse testatur Athanasius in epist. ad omnes orthodoxos; constat autem ex chronico Hieronymi Marcum papam eo tempore jam fuisse defunctum. Deinde si Marcus papa exemplum misisset ad Alexandrinos ex Romano scrinio certe convenissent deinceps inter se exemplaria Romanum et Alexandrinum; quomodo ergo in exemplari a S. Cyrillo ex Alexandria ad Africanos misso deerant isti canones tres qui inveniebantur in Romano?"—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 25. [p. 334.]

¹ "Hieronymus præfat. in Judith asserit a concilio Nicæno librum

book of Judith among the books of the canon, but only that some said it did; but that it did not, Bishop Lindan bringeth very good reasons, as I have elsewhere showed¹. The like may be said of the permitting of clergymen having wives to live with their wives. For the histories² do not say, the council passed a decree to that purpose, but that whereas the fathers of the council were about to have made a decree for the restraining of clergymen from matrimonial society with their wives, they were by Paphnutius, a worthy bishop and holy confessor, dissuaded from so doing, and induced to leave it free as they found it. The observation of the feast of Easter upon the Lord's day, is the third instance given by the cardinal. But if Zosimus, Bonifacius, and Cœlestinus, could have brought as good proof that the decree they urged was passed in the council of Nice, as may be brought for the decree touching the keeping of Easter only on the Lord's day, they had never been resisted, though they could not have found it in the canons. For the order that the council took for uniformity in the keeping of this feast, is mentioned in the Epistle of the council to the Churches of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis; and all histories and writers do agree on it. Touching the having of two bishops in one city³, which Augustine⁴ saith, Valerius his predecessor knew not to be forbidden by the council of Nice, when he caused him to be ordained bishop, and

Judith inter canonicos receptum: at non reperitur hoc inter canones Ruffini."—Bellarm. [Ibid.]

¹ Book iv. Chap. 23. [Tom. II. p. 483.]

² "Ἐδόκει τοῖς ἐπισκόποις νόμον νεαρὸν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσφέρειν, ὥστε τοὺς ἱερωμένους, λέγω δὲ ἐπισκόπους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, μὴ συγκαθεύδειν ταῖς γαμεταῖς ἅς ἔτι λαϊκοὶ ὄντες ἡγάγοντο. Καὶ ἐπεὶ περὶ τούτου βουλευέσθαι προὔκειτο, διαναστὰς ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ συλλόγου τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὁ Παφνύτιος ἐβόα μακρὰ μὴ βαρὺν ζυγὸν ἐπιθεῖναι τοῖς ἱερωμένοις ἀνδράσιν.... πείθεται πᾶς ὁ τῶν ἱερωμένων σύλλογος τοῖς Παφνυτίου λόγοις."—Socrat. Hist. Eccl. Lib. I. cap. 8. [Leg. 11. p. 38. Cantabr. 1720.]

³ "Augustinus epist. 110 de designan. succes. asserit, in concilio Nicæno prohibitum ne duo episcopi simul sedeant in eadem ecclesia, contra quem canonem se imprudenter fecisse dolenter refert: at iste canon nusquam apparet inter illos 20."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

⁴ "Adhuc in corpore posito beatæ memoriæ patre et episcopo meo sene Valerio, episcopus ordinatus sum, et sedi cum illo; quod concilio Nicæno prohibitum fuisse nesciebam."—August. Epist. cx. [Al. Epist. ccxiii. Tom. II. col. 790, A.]

to sit together with him, while he yet lived ; it is strange that Bellarmine should deny it to be found among the twenty canons we speak of, when as in the eighth canon¹ it is expressly provided, that if a Novatian bishop return to the unity of the Church in any city where there is a catholic bishop already, the catholic bishop shall look out for him some place in his diocese, that he may be a chorepiscopus, or shall appoint him to be a presbyter ; that both he may remain in the clergy, and that yet there may not seem to be two bishops in one city. That Atticus in the end of the council of Chalcedon saith², the manner of writing those letters, that were called *Litteræ formatæ*, was devised in the council of Nice, no way proveth the thing in question. For we inquire not, what was there devised, but what was there decreed. Lastly, that which the council of Africa hath, as out of the council of Nice³, that none should celebrate the holy sacrament of the eucharist but such as are fasting : and Ambrose⁴, that none should be taken into the clergy that have been twice married, might by them be taken upon uncertain report, as that touching the book of Judith was by Hierome. But to what purpose doth Bellarmine insist upon these allegations ? and why doth he so carefully labour to show that all the decrees of the Nicene Council are not com-

¹ “Εἰ δὲ τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου ὄντος προσέρχονται τινες, πρόδηλον ὡς ὁ μὲν ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔξει τὸ ἀξίωμα τοῦ ἐπισκόπου· ὁ δὲ ὀνομαζόμενος παρὰ τοῖς λεγομένοις καθαροῖς ἐπίσκοπος ἢ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τιμὴν ἔξει, πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα δοκοίη τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτὸν μετέχειν. Εἰ δὲ τοῦτο αὐτῷ μὴ ἀρέσκει ἐπινοήσῃ τὸν ἢ χωρεπισκόπου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ὅλως δοκεῖν εἶναι, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ᾖσιν.”—Concil. Nicæn. Can. 8. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 37.]

² “In fin. conc. Chalced. Atticus refert in concilio Nicæno determinatam fuisse rationem scribendarum formatarum epistolarum.”—[Bellarm. ubi supra.]

³ “In concilio Africano, can. 14, asserunt patres ex canone Nicæni concilii non licere nisi jejunis offerre eucharistiam: at ubi est iste canon inter illos 20 ?”—[Id. Ibid.]

⁴ “Ambrosius in epist. 82 docet, in concilio Nicæno statutum ne bigamus in clerum asciscatur: at neque hoc in illis 20 canonibus invenitur.”—[Ibid.]

“Cognoscamus non solum hoc apostolum de episcopo et presbytero statuisset, sed etiam patres in concilio Nicæno tractatus addidisse neque clericum quenquam debere esse, qui secunda conjugia sortitus sit.”—Ambros. Epist. lxxxii. [Al. Epist. lxiii. Tom. II. col. 1037.]

prised within the twenty canons now extant? Is it because he would thereby make us think the Nicene council did decree any such thing concerning appeals, as was alleged in the council of Africa by the pope's agents? Surely no. For he professeth he thinketh it very probable that the pretended canons were never made by the Nicene council, but that they were the canons of the council of Sardica¹: and his reason is, because these canons are in the council of Sardica, in the very words alleged. And it is not likely the fathers in that council would make the same canons the council of Nice did, and no way express it, that they did not make new, but renew such as were made before. Which if it be so, it must needs be confessed, that the bishops of Rome were deceived and mistook, when they alleged canons as made in the council of Nice, that were not made there, but in the council of Sardica. Yet Bellarmine is unwilling to yield so much to the truth, though it be very mighty and ready to prevail with him: and therefore rather than he will confess any error or mistaking, he affirmeth that both these are to be esteemed but as one council: because many of the same bishops were present in them both, and confirmed the same faith. A strange saying doubtless, and contradicted by himself. For in his book *De Conciliis*², sorting councils into three ranks, accounting some wholly rejected, some wholly approved, and some in part rejected, and in part approved; he reckoneth the council of Nice among those of the second sort, and the council of Sardica among those of the

¹ "Concilium Nicænum et Sardicense pro uno et eodem habebantur.... Cur autem simul cum Nicæno Sardicense concilium conjunctum fuerit, ratio est, quia iidem patres magna ex parte in utroque concilio interfuerunt, et nihil novi quoad fidem in Sardicensi definitum est, sed solum Nicæna fides roborata."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "Quædam concilia sunt ab apostolica sede approbata atque ab ecclesia universa recepta; quædam omnino reprobata; quædam partim approbata partim reprobata; quædam nec approbata nec reprobata. Quod membrum postremum in conciliis particularibus potissimum locum habet."—Bellarm. De Concil. Lib. i. cap. 4. [Tom. ii. p. 2.]

"Concilia generalia approbata numerantur hucusque decem et octo. Primum est Nicænum," &c.—Id. cap. 5.

"Primum generale partim confirmatum partim reprobatum est Sardicense concilium, episcoporum 376 anno Domini 351 tempore Constantii et Julii I. ex quibus 300 episcopi occidentales fidem catholicam confirmarunt, reliqui 76 episcopi orientales fidem Arianam scripserunt."—Id. cap. 7. [p. 6.]

third sort: because consisting of three hundred seventy and six bishops, the three hundred occidental bishops confirmed the catholic faith, and they of the East dividing themselves from them, confirmed the heresy of the Arians: whereas here he will have it to be the same with the council of Nice, for that it was a general council approved, and not reckoned in number the second. But let us pardon them this error and mistaking, and see what it was the council of Sardica decreed. The words of the fathers of the council are these¹: “It hath seemed good unto us, that if a bishop shall be accused, and the bishops of the same region shall judge him and degrade him; if he that is so deposed or degraded, shall appeal and fly to the bishop of Rome, and desire to be heard, if he think good to renew the judgment, let him be pleased to write to the bishops that are in the next province, that they may diligently inquire into things, and judge according to truth and equity. But if he that desireth to have his cause heard again, shall move the bishop of Rome to send a presbyter from his own side, let him do what he thinketh fit. And if he shall think fit to send some, who being present with the bishops may judge together with them, having his authority from whom they are sent, let him do as he pleaseth. And if he think the bishops to be sufficient to put an end to the matter, let him use his own discretion.” For the clearing of this matter, and that we may the better discern the force of this decree: first, we must mark that it was made after the division and parting

¹ “Ὁσιος ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν, Ἦρεσεν, ἵν’ εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος καταγγελθείη, καὶ συναθροισθέντες οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τῆς ἐνορίας τῆς αὐτῆς τοῦ βαθμοῦ αὐτὸν ἀποκινήσωσι, καὶ ὥσπερ ἐγκαλεσάμενος καταφύγῃ ἐπὶ τὸν μακαριώτατον τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ βουλευθείη αὐτοῦ διακοῦσαι, δίκαιόν τε εἶναι νομίση ἀνανεώσασθαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξέτασιν τοῦ πράγματος, γράφειν τοῦτοις τοῖς συνεπισκόποις καταξιώσῃ, τοῖς ἀγχιστεύουσιν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ, ἵνα αὐτοὶ ἐπιμελῶς καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἕκαστα διερευνήσωσι, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας πίστιν ψῆφον περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἐξενέγκωσιν. Εἰ δέ τις ἀξιῶν καὶ πάλιν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀκουσθῆναι, καὶ τῇ δεήσει τῇ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν Ῥωμαίων ἐπίσκοπον κινεῖν δόξῃ ἵν’ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου πλευροῦ πρεσβυτέρους ἀποστείλοι, εἶναι ἐν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ὅπερ ἂν καλῶς ἔχειν δοκιμάσῃ, καὶ ὀρίσῃ δεῖν ἀποσταλῆναι τοὺς μετὰ τῶν ἐπισκόπων κρινοῦντας, ἔχοντας τε τὴν αὐθεντίαν τούτου παρ’ οὗ ἀπεστάλησαν· καὶ τοῦτο θετέον. Εἰ δὲ ἐξαρκεῖν νομίση πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πράγματος ἐπίγνωσιν καὶ ἀπόφασιν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ποιήσῃ ὅπερ ἂν τῇ ἐμφρονεστάτῃ αὐτοῦ βουλῇ καλῶς ἔχειν δόξῃ. Ἀπεκρίναντο οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, Τὰ λεχθέντα ἤρεσεν.”—Concil. Sardic. [Can. 5. Labbe, Tom. II. col. 660.]

of the bishops of the East from them of the West, and so by the western bishops alone, and, as it may seem, respectively to the provinces of the West, over which the bishop of Rome was patriarch. Secondly, that the Africans took no notice of it; and yet there were bishops of Africa at that council; so that in likelihood this decree was not confirmed by subsequent acceptation, execution, and practice. Thirdly, that the council of Chalcedon¹, which was absolutely œcumenical, and wholly approved, and so of greater authority than this, that was not an approved general council, but in a sort only, decreeth the contrary, and referreth the final determination of all causes of bishops to the primate or patriarch, which the emperor also confirmeth, and will have no man to have power to contradict the end which the primate or patriarch shall make. Lastly, that this canon maketh rather against them that allege it, than any way for them. For by this canon all matters must be ended at home, or in the next province to that wherein they arise; and the pope may not call matters to Rome there to be heard, but is only permitted in some cases to send a presbyter having his authority, and to put him in commission with the bishops of the province, that so he and they jointly may re-examine things formerly judged. If this canon were now observed, I think there would not be so great exception taken to the court of Rome, in respect of appeals, as now there is. *Quousque*, saith St Bernard to Eugenius², *non evigilat consideratio tua ad tantam appellationum confusionem? Ambitio in Ecclesia per te regnare molitur. Præter jus et fas, præter morem et ordinem fiunt: repertum ad remedium, reperitur ad mortem. Antidotum versum est in venenum: murmur loquor et querimoniam communem Ecclesiarum. Truncari se clamant et demembrari. Vel nullæ, vel paucae admodum sunt, quæ plagam istam aut non doleant, aut non timeant*: that is, “How long will it be before thou awake to consider this so great confusion of appeals? Ambition striveth and seeketh busily to reign in the Church by thy means. They

¹ “Εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίη, καταλαμβάνετω ἢ τὸν ἑξάρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ δικάζεσθω.”—Concil. Chalced. Can. 9. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1685.]

² Bernard. Lib. iii. De Consider. ad Eugenium. [Vid. cap. 2. Tom. ii. col. 434. Par. 1719.]

are entered, prosecuted, and admitted, beside right and law, besides custom and order. That which was first found out for a remedy, is now found to be unto death. I do but express the murmuring and common complaint of the Churches. They cry out that they are mangled and dismembered, and there are few or none found that do not either already grieve at this plague, or fear the smart of this evil." Yet would not the Africans admit the canon of the council of Sardica, but willed the pope to send no more any of his clerks, to dispatch causes at any man's suit. For that this was to bring in the smoky puff of worldly pride into the Church; and in very earnest sort besought him not to be too easy in admitting any appeals brought from them. If within a little time after the bishops of Rome prevailed so far as that bishops were suffered to appeal out of Africa to Rome, which was the thing claimed by Zosimus, but denied unto him by the Africans, it is not to be marvelled at, seeing they still enlarged the extent of their power, till they had overthrown the jurisdiction of all the bishops of the West, and alienated the affections of all other from them. So that there was a schism in the Church, the other four patriarchs dividing themselves from the bishop of Rome, and at their parting using these or the like words, as it is reported¹: "Thy greatness we know, thy covetousness we cannot satisfy, thy encroaching we can no longer endure; live by thyself." But here we shall find a great contrariety of judgment among the greatest rabbies of the Romish Church touching these Africans that thus withstood the claims of Zosimus, Bonifacius, and Cœlestinus. For Harding² against

¹ "Ad hoc facit quod dicunt aliqui eos alias scripsisse papæ, 'Potentiam tuam recognoscimus, avaritiam tuam implere non possumus, vivite per vos.'"—Gerson. Serm. de Pace et Unione Græcorum. Consid. 7. [Tom. II. col. 148. Antw. 1706.]

² "After that the whole church of Africa had continued in schism, and withdrawn themselves from the obedience of the see apostolic, through the enticement of Aurelius, archbishop of Carthago, for the space of one hundred years, during which time by God's punishment they came into captivity of the barbarous and cruel Vandals, who were Arians: at the length when it pleased God of his goodness to have pity on his people of that province, sending them Belisarius the valiant captain that vanquished and destroyed the Vandals, and likewise Eulalius that godly archbishop of Carthago, that brought the church home again, and joined the divided members unto the whole

bishop Jewel's Challenge, in the article of the Supremacy, saith, that the whole Church of Africa withdrew itself from the Church of Rome by reason of this difference, through the enticement of Aurelius archbishop of Carthage, and continued in schism by the space of an hundred years; during which time by God's punishment they were brought into miserable captivity by the barbarous and cruel Vandals, who were Arians; till at length, when it pleased Almighty God of his goodness to have pity of his people of that province, he sent them Belisarius, that valiant captain, that vanquished and destroyed the Vandals, and Eulabius, that godly bishop of Carthage, that brought home the Africans again, and joined those divided members to the whole body of the catholic Church: a public instrument containing their submission, being made and offered to Bonifacius the Second, by Eulabius, in the name of the whole province: which was joyfully received; and whereof Bonifacius writeth to Eulabius bishop of Thessalonica, desiring him to give thanks to God for the same. But Bellarmine proveth at large, that notwithstanding this resistance and opposition of the Africans against the claims of Zosimus, Bonifacius, and Coelestinus, yet there never was any apparent breach between the Romans and them. And for the Epistle of Bonifacius the Second to Eulabius, wherein he saith very harshly (as Cusanus¹ well noteth) that Aurelius, sometime bishop of the Church of Carthage, with his colleagues, began to wax proud and insolent against the Church of Rome, by the instigation of the devil in the days of his predecessors, (so condemning Augustine, Alipius, and two hundred and twenty-five bishops more, as set on by the devil to resist the claims of his predecessors, and the

body, the catholic church; a public instrument containing the form of their repentance, and of their humble submission, was offered and exhibited solemnly to Bonifacius the Second, then pope, by Eulalius, in the name of that whole province, which was joyfully received, and he thereupon forthwith reconciled. Of this reconciliation and restoring of the African Churches to the catholic Church, the mystical body of Christ, Bonifacius writeth his letters to Eulalius, bishop of Thessalonica, requiring him with the Churches thereabout to give Almighty God thanks for it."—Harding, *Apud Jewel*. [Apology, Art. 4. Vol. II. p. 271. Oxon. 1848.]

¹ "Licet epistola illa sit multum notanda, . . . tamen durum videtur illud quod dicitur in eadem, Valerium cum collegis errasse," &c.—Nicol. De Cusa, *De Concord. Cathol.* Lib. II. cap. 15. [p. 732.]

epistles of Eulabius bishop of Carthage, wherein he condemneth his predecessors, and submitteth himself to the bishop of Rome,) he professeth he greatly suspecteth they are forged and counterfeit¹. First, because that which is contained in them cannot stand with that which is most certainly proved and known to be true touching the amity and friendship that was between the Roman Church and Augustine, Eugenius, Fulgentius, and other Africans, after the opposition about the matters of appeals. Secondly, for that there was no such Eulabius bishop of Alexandria at that time, to whom Bonifacius might write, as it appeareth by the chronology of Nicephorus of Constantinople. Thirdly, for that Bonifacius in his epistle doth signify that he wrote in the time of Justinus the emperor; whereas Justinus was dead before Bonifacius was bishop, as appeareth by all histories. So that we may see what gross forgeries there have been in former times devised only to abuse the simple, and make the world believe that all bishops and Churches subjected themselves unto the Church of Rome; and how shameless a defender of antichristian tyranny Dr Harding was, that could not escape this censure of Bellarmine the Jesuit. But it is less to be marvelled at, that he should so harden his forehead as not to blush when he brought into the light, and presented to the view of the world such rotten forgeries, that was not ashamed to become a proctor of the filthy stews.

Wherefore, leaving him and his counterfeit and apocryphal stuff, which he sought to vent unto the world, let us proceed from the appeals of laymen, inferior clergymen and bishops, to speak of the appeals of the chief primates or patriarchs. For the clearing of which point, we must observe, that it is a rule in church-government, that the lesser and inferior may not judge the greater and superior. And therefore the bishops of the province may not judge the metropolitan, but may only declare in what cases he is judged, excommunicated, sus-

¹ "Respondeo valde mihi eas epistolas esse suspectas; nam in primis pugnare videntur cum iis quæ diximus de conjunctione Augustini, Eugenii, Fulgentii, et aliorum Africanorum cum Romana ecclesia. Deinde Eulalius Alexandrinus ad quem Bonifacius scribere videtur nullus fuit, aut certe eo tempore non fuit, ut patet ex Chronol. Nicephori Constant. Præterea Bonifacius significat in epistola sua Justino inoperante se scribere, at Justinus obierat antequam Bonifacius sedere inciperet, ut ex historiis omnibus constat."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

pended, or deposed, *ipso facto*, by the sentence of the canon itself, and by separating themselves from him, and withdrawing themselves from being subject to him, put him in a sort from his place, and depose him. But otherwise, if any bishop have ought against his metropolitan, he must go (as I showed before) to the patriarch, and his synod, to complain, as to fit and competent judges. For against the greater person we complain, to the greater judge we must fly. If a clerk have ought against a bishop, the matter may be judged in the synod of the province; but if clerk or bishop have any complaint against the metropolitan, the canon of the council of Chalcedon provideth (as I noted before) that they shall go to the primate of the diocese, or to the see of the princely city of Constantinople. From whence in like proportion it is consequent, that though the metropolitans and bishops subject to a patriarch, may declare in what cases he incurreth the sentence of suspension, excommunication, deposition, or degradation, pronounced by the very law and canon itself, and so withdraw themselves from his obedience; yet may they not by way of authority proceed against him, but must fly to another patriarch, who in a synod consisting of his own bishops, and the bishops of that patriarch that is complained of, may judge and censure him, so that he be a patriarch in order and honour greater than he against whom they complain; seeing the lesser may not judge the greater. And therefore we find that in the differences that fell out between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch¹, John was blamed, for that being but bishop or patriarch of the third see, he took upon him to judge Cyril, that was patriarch of the second; and having but a few bishops joined with him, to judge Cyril with many. So likewise Dioscorus was condemned, not only for favouring the wicked heresy of Eutyches, and his violent proceedings in the second council of Ephesus; but specially for that being but bishop of the second see he took upon him to judge Leo, that was bishop of the first see. And this was that which Julius, in his epistle reported by Athanasius in his second apology, blamed in the bishops of the East; namely, that they proceeded to the judging of bishops of such sees, as were Athanasius of Alexandria, and Paulus of

¹ See these things at large in the epistle of Nicholas the First to Michael the emperor, Epist. ii. [Labbe, Tom. ix. col. 1315, sqq.]

Constantinople, without making him first acquainted with the same; that so their proceedings might have taken beginning from him, as being in order the first among the patriarchs. And hence it was, that Theophilus¹ bishop of Alexandria, taking himself to be bishop of the second see, came to Constantinople, and there with other bishops judged Chrysostom; and that Chrysostom, as being by virtue of the canon of the council of Constantinople made bishop of the second see, and set in order and honour before the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, would have taken upon him to judge some matters concerning Theophilus: and in this sort did sundry bishops of Rome in synods consisting of their own bishops, and the bishops subject to the patriarch of Constantinople, judge and depose certain bishops of Constantinople. Whereupon Nicholas the First, in his epistle to Michael the emperor, saith², that scarce any bishop of Constantinople can be found, that was orderly deposed and driven from his bishopric, and whose deposition held as good and lawful, without the consent of the bishop of Rome; and therefore protesteth against the deposition of Ignatius as unlawful and unjust, for that he was condemned by his own bishops: comparing the synod that deposed him to the second of Ephesus, and affirming, that it was much worse than that; for that there Dioscorus bishop of Alexandria, with his colleagues, judged Flavianus, though most violently and disorderly; but here there was none of the patriarchs, nor any one bishop of any the meanest city, that was not his own suffragan. By that which hath been said it is evident, that the great patriarchs of the Christian Church are not to be judged but by some other of their own rank in order before them, assisted by inferior bishops³; that the bishop of

¹ Vide supra, Chap. xxxv. [p. 307.]

² "Ut calamum ad Constantinopolitanos præsules specialiter extendamus, aut nunquam omnino, aut certe vix horum aliquis sine consensu Romani pontificis reperitur ejectus, qui tamen hactenus inter depositos annumeretur, et non ab hæreticis vel tyrannis pulsus, aut interemptus commemoretur...."

"Cur ergo cum ita sit, in solo Ignatio Petri memoriam despicere, ac oblivioni tradere studuistis, nisi quia pro voto cuncta facere voluistis, constituentes synodum Ephesinæ secundæ crudelitate consimilem? quamvis ibi Alexandrinus erat qui cum ceteris sibi sociatis compatriarchis adversus sanctum Flavianum agebat."—Nicol. Epist. viii. ad Michael. Imperat. [Labbe, Tom. ix. col. 1329.]

³ Gelas. Ep. xiii. ad Episc. Dardaniæ. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 324, sqq.]

Rome, as first in order among the patriarchs, assisted with his own bishops, and the bishops of him that is thought faulty, may judge any of the other patriarchs; that such as have complaints against them, may fly to him and the synods of bishops subject to him; and that the patriarchs themselves in their distresses may fly to him and such synods for relief and help, though of himself alone he have no power to do any thing.

Wherefore let us proceed from the distinction and explication of the diverse and different kinds of appeals, lawful and unlawful, permitted and forbidden, to examine the allegations of our adversaries, and to see whether from any allowed practice and approved course of appeals made to Rome, in the primitive Church, they can infer the universality of papal power and jurisdiction. The first example that Bellarmine¹ bringeth is very impertinent. For whereas he should prove, that the bishops subject to any of the four patriarchs might lawfully appeal to Rome, and that there lay appeals from any part of the world thither; he bringeth forth the testimony of Leo² telling the bishops of France, subject to him as patriarch of the West, that of ancient time appeals were wont to be made out of France to Rome: which no way proveth the bishop of Rome to be universal bishop, unless we will acknowledge every one of the patriarchs to have been so too; it being lawful to appeal unto them out of any the remotest provinces subject to them. From this ill-chosen example, he proceedeth to a worse, of Marcion the heretic³, who being excommunicated by his own bishop in Pontus, fled to Rome that he might be absolved of the

¹ "Etiam ante concilium Sardicense erat mos in ecclesia ad pontificem appellandi, ut merito Leo epist. 89 ad episc. Galliæ dicit, hanc esse antiquissimam consuetudinem."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 21. [p. 331.]

² "Nobiscum itaque vestra fraternitas recognoscat apostolicam sedem pro sui reverentia a vestræ etiam provinciæ sacerdotibus innumeris relationibus esse consultam, et per diversarum, quemadmodum vetus consuetudo poscebat, appellationem causarum, aut retractata aut confirmata fuisse judicia."—Leo, Epist. lxxxix. [Al. Epist. x. Tom. I. col. 634.]

³ "Anno 142 Christi, Pio I. pontifice, Marcion excommunicatus ab episcopo suo in Ponto venit Romam, ut a Romana ecclesia absolveretur, ut Epiphanius refert. hæres. 42."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

Roman Church, as he telleth us out of Epiphanius¹. But surely it is most strange that he can be content thus to abuse himself and others. For he knoweth right well, that Marcion did not appeal to Rome, and that if he had so done, the act of a vile and execrable heretic should not be drawn into example. The history of Marcion (as we find in Epiphanius) is this: Marcion was the son of a bishop in Pontus; he embraced virginity in his first times, and seemed to live a retired, solitary, and monastical kind of life; but in the end, casting the fear of God behind his back, he abused a certain virgin; and not only fell himself, but drew her also away from the course of virtue and well-doing into the fellowship of sinful wickedness. Hereupon he was excommunicated and put out of the Church by his own father. For his father was a right good and virtuous man, and careful of the things that concerned his calling; and though after he was put out of his Church, he sought very earnestly to be admitted to penitency, that so he might be restored to the Church again, yet his father exceedingly grieved, not only in respect of his fall, but also in respect of the dishonour and shame he had brought on him, would by no means be induced to yield unto it. Whereupon he left that city whereof his father was bishop, and went to Rome in the time of the

¹ “ Οὗτος [ὁ Μαρκίων] τὸ γένος Ποντικὸς ὑπῆρχεν, Ἐλενοπόντου δὲ φημι, Σινώπης δὲ πόλεως, ὥς πολὺς περὶ αὐτοῦ ᾄδεται λόγος. Τὸν δὲ πρῶτον αὐτοῦ βίον παρθενίαν δῆθεν ἥσκει. Μονάζων γὰρ ὑπῆρχε καὶ υἱὸς ἐπισκόπου τῆς ὑμετέρας ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Χρόνου δὲ προΐοντος προσφθείρεται παρθένω τινὶ, καὶ ἐξαπατήσας τὴν παρθένον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτὴν τε καὶ ἑαυτὸν κατέσπασε, καὶ τὴν φθορὰν ἀπεργασάμενος ἐξεοὔται τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου πατρός. Ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῦ ὁ πατήρ δι’ ὑπερβολὴν εὐλαβείας τῶν διαφανῶν, καὶ σφόδρα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπιμελομένων, διαπρέπων ἐν τῇ τῆς ἐπισκόπου λειτουργίᾳ. Πολλὰ δῆθεν ὁ Μαρκίων καθικετεύσας καὶ αἰτήσας μετάνοιαν οὐκ εἴληφε παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου πατρός. Πόνος γὰρ εἶχε τὸν ἀξιόλογον γέροντα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἐξεπέσεν ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ αἷσχος ἔφερεν. Ὡς τοίνυν οὐκ ἔτυχε παρ’ αὐτοῦ, διὰ τῆς κολακείας ὧν ἐδέετο μὴ φέρων τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν χλεύην, ἀποδιδράσκει τῆς πόλεως τῆς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἄνεισιν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην αὐτὴν, μετὰ τὸ τελευτῆσαι Ὑγῖνον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Ῥώμης. Οὗτος δὲ ἑνατος ἦν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου τῶν ἀποστόλων. Καὶ τοῖς ἔτι πρεσβύταις περιούσι καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁρμωμένοις συμβάλων ἦται συναχθῆναι, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῷ συγκεχώρηκε. Ζήλῳ λοιπὸν ἐπαρθεὶς, ὥς οὐκ ἀπείληφε τὴν προεδρίαν τε καὶ τὴν εἰσδυσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐπινοεῖ ἑαυτῷ καὶ προσφεύγει τῇ τοῦ ἀπατεῶνος Κέρδωνος αἵρέσει.”—Epiphanius. *Hæres.* XLII. [Tom. i. p. 302. Colon. 1682.]

vacancy of that see, after the death of Hyginus; and after he had stayed there a certain space, and conferred with the presbyters of that Church, he desired to be admitted to their assemblies. But they told him, they could not so do without the consent of his honourable father. For (say they) we have one faith, and one consent, and we may not contrary our good fellow-minister thy father. Which their answer when he heard, he was filled with fury and madness, and professed in great rage, that he would rend their Church in pieces, and cast a schism into it that should never have an end. This is the narration we find in Epiphanius concerning Marcion his going to Rome. Wherein there is nothing that any way proveth, that it was always lawful to appeal from all other bishops to the bishop of Rome. For first, it doth not appear that Marcion went thither to complain of his father, but being put from the communion by him, and not obtaining reconciliation by any intreaty, as a runagate he sought to other places, and among other went to Rome, hoping there to be received into the Church. But the guides of that Church knowing the canon, which forbiddeth one Church to admit them another hath rejected and cast out, utterly refused to permit and suffer him to communicate with them. And secondly, if he had gone to Rome by way of appeal, it would most strongly overthrow all such courses, and prove that the Roman bishop may not reverse and make void the acts and proceedings of other bishops, seeing the governors of the Roman Church at that time freely professed unto Marcion, and told him peremptorily, that it was not lawful for them to admit him to their communion without his father's consent, by whom he was excommunicated. But the truth is, he did not seek by their authority as superiors to reverse his father's censure and judgment, or to be restored to the communion of that Church out of which he was ejected, (which had been to appeal,) but being in Rome, desired only to be admitted to join in prayers and other exercises of religion, with them of that Church; which yet (as Epiphanius reporteth) was denied unto him. The next example is of Fortunatus and Felix in Africa, deposed by Cyprian (as Bellarmine¹ would make us

¹ "Anno 252, pontifice Cornelio, Fortunatus et Felix in Africa a Cypriano depositi Romam navigarunt, atque ad Cornelium appellarunt. Testis Cyprianus, Lib. i. Epist. iii."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

believe), and appealing to Cornelius bishop of Rome for relief. But there is no word of truth in that which this cardinal writeth. For these men did not go to Rome to complain that they were unjustly deposed, (as he untruly reporteth,) but these are the circumstances of the matter, as we may read in the Epistles of Cyprian¹. A company of wicked ones having made Fortunatus (one of the presbyters that were suspended by Cyprian, and a great number of other bishops,) a bishop in opposition to Cyprian, hasten to Rome to Cornelius with false reports of the number of bishops that concurred in the ordination of Fortunatus; that so he might be induced to admit of him as a true bishop, and hold communion with him. Which when Cornelius wisely refused to do, he feared not to threaten grievous things unto him. With the suddenness and strangeness whereof Cornelius much moved, marvelled greatly that Cyprian had not before certified him of this schismatical ordination, that so he might have been the better prepared. Whereunto Cyprian answered, that it was not necessary to be so careful about the vain proceedings of heretics, that he had before given him the names of such bishops as were sound, to whom and from whom he might write and receive letters. And that howsoever false and ill dealing by haste and prevention thinketh to gain all, yet that is but for a little time, till truth overtake it, and discover it, even as the darkness of the night continueth till the sun arise. And farther he sheweth, that these schismatical companions had no reason to make such haste to Rome, to publish it and make it known,

¹ "Quæ autem causa veniendi et pseudo-episcopum contra episcopos factum nunciandi? aut enim placet illis quod fecerunt, et in suo scelere perseverant; aut si displicet et recedunt sciunt quo revertantur. Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, et æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur ubi est crimen admissum, et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus; oportet utique eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare, nec episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sua subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint: nisi si desperatis et perditis minor videtur esse auctoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum qui jam de illis judicaverunt, et eorum conscientiam multis delictorum laqueis vincitam judicii sui nuper gravitate damnarunt."—Cyprian. [Epist. lix. p. 136.]

that they had set up a false bishop against a true. For that either it pleased them that they had so done, and then they continued, and went forward in their wickedness; or they repented of that they had done, and then they knew whither to return, and needed not to have gone to Rome. "For," saith he, "whereas it is agreed among us, and it is both just and right, that every man shall be heard there where his fault was committed; and all pastors have a part of the flock of Christ assigned to them, which every one is to rule and govern, as being to give an account unto the Lord of his actions; it is not fit, nor to be suffered, that they over whom we are set should run up and down, and by crafty and deceitful rashness shake in sunder the coherent concord of brethren, but that they should have their causes handled where they may have both accusers and witnesses of their crimes. Unless a few desperate and wicked companions do think the bishops of Africa that judged them have lesser authority than others." A more clear testimony or pregnant proof against appeals to Rome than this cannot be had: and yet this is one of the principal authorities the cardinal bringeth to prove the lawfulness of appeals to Rome. To the next place alleged out of Cyprian¹, touching Basilides and Martialis bishops of Spain, I have answered already²; and made it most clear, that nothing could be alleged more prejudicial to the pope's claims, and more for the advantage of the truth of that cause which we defend. So that it seemeth our adversaries have turned their weapons against themselves, and whetted their swords, and made ready their arrows, to wound themselves to death. How the facts of Athanasius, Chrysostom, Flavianus, and Theodoret, appealing to the bishop of Rome with his western synods, for relief and help, when they were oppressed and wronged by the eastern bishops, prove not the illimited and universal power of the pope, I have at large showed before³, to the satisfaction (I doubt not) of all indifferent readers. And therefore there remaineth but only one allegation of Bellarmine touching appeals to be examined. "Gregory the

¹ "Non diu post Stephano pontifice Basilides in Hispania depositus ad Stephanum appellavit."—Cyprianus, Lib. i. Epist. iv. [Bellarm. ubi supra.]

² Chap. xxxvii. [p. 344 supra.]

³ Chap. xxxv. and xxxvii. [pp. 302, 350 supra.]

First," saith he¹, "put John the bishop of Justiniana the first from the communion, for that he presumed to judge the bishop of Thebes having appealed to Rome. The case was this². The bishop of Thebes, wronged by his fellow-bishops, made his appeal to Rome. Hereupon John bishop of Justiniana the first, who was the bishop of Rome's vicegerent for certain provinces near adjoining, was appointed by the emperor to hear the cause; which he did accordingly. But without all indifferency, and (in sort) contrary to the canons; and though upon the discerning of his unjust and partial proceeding an appeal were tendered to him, yet gave he sentence against the poor distressed bishop. Gregory hearing hereof, putteth him from the communion for thirty days' space, enjoining him to bewail his fault with sorrowful repentance and tears." Truly this allegation maketh a very fair show at the first sight. But if we remember that the bishop of Justiniana the first, and the distressed bishop of Thebes, wronged by him, were within the patriarchship of Rome (as Cusanus³ sheweth they were), you shall find it was no more that the bishop of Rome did, than any other patriarch in like case might have done, within his own precincts and limits. Neither can the cardinal ever prove that the bishop of Rome had any such vicegerent as the bishop of Justiniana the first was, but only within the compass of his own patriarchship. "But," saith he, "it was a Greek bishop

¹ "Post annum 500, Gregorius lib. II. Epist. vi. privat sacra communione Joannem episcopum Græcum primæ Justinianæ, quod judicasset episcopum Thebanum qui ad apostolicam sedem appellaverat. Omitto posteriorum temporum testimonia quod ea ab hæreticis contemnantur."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "Quod vero ad præsens attinet, cassatis prius atque ad nihilum redactis prædictæ sententiæ tuæ decretis, ex beati Petri principis apostolorum auctoritate decernimus triginta dierum spatio te sacra communione privatum ab omnipotenti Deo nostro tanti excessus veniam cum summa pœnitentia ac lacrymis exorare."—Greg. [Lib. III. Epist. vi. Tom. II. col. 628.]

³ "Hilarius diaconus tunc Thessalonicensis vicem apostolicæ sedis habuit, per Epirum veterem et novum Illyricum, Macedoniam, Thessaliam, Achaiam, Daciam, Riperensem, et Mediterraneam, Mysiam, Dardanium, et Prævalum: et sic maximam partem quoniam quasi totam Europam, et Africæ magnam partem patriarchatus Romanus sub se habuit."—Nicol. de Cusa, De Concord. Cathol. Lib. II. cap. 7. [p. 719, Bas. 1565.]

that Gregory thus proceeded against." It is true, it was so. But what will he infer from thence? Is it not known that many Greek bishops were subject to the bishop of Rome as patriarch of the West? Was not the bishop of Thessalonica a Greek bishop? and yet I think no man doubteth but that he was within the compass of the patriarchship of Rome, as many other also were, howsoever in time they fell from it, and adhered to the Church of Constantinople, after the division of the Greek and Latin Churches.

CHAPTER XL.

OF THE POPE'S SUPPOSED EXEMPTION FROM ALL HUMAN JUDGMENT, AS BEING RESERVED TO THE JUDGMENT OF CHRIST ONLY.

OUR adversaries, finding their proofs of the pope's illimited power, taken from such appeals as were wont in ancient times to be made to Rome, to be too weak, fly to another, wherein they put more confidence, which is his exemption from all human judgment: Christ (whose vicar he is) having reserved him to his own judgment only. If this exemption could be as strongly proved, as it is confidently affirmed, it would be an unanswerable proof of the thing in question. But the proof hereof will be more hard than of the principal thing in controversy between us. Touching this point, I find great contrariety of opinions among papists¹, as men at their

¹ "Sunt de hac re quinque opiniones. Prima est Alberti Pighii, qui contendit papam non posse esse hæreticum, proinde nec deponi in ullo casu, quæ sententia probabilis est, &c.

"Est ergo secunda opinio papam eo ipso quo in hæresim incidit etiam interiorem tantum esse extra ecclesiam et depositum a Deo, quocirca ab ecclesia posse judicari, id est, declarari depositum jure divino et deponi de facto si adhuc recuset cedere.

"Tertia opinio est in altero extremo nimirum papam neque per hæresim occultam neque per manifestam esse depositum aut deponi posse.

"Quarta opinio est Cajetani in Tract. de Auctor. Papæ et Conc. cap. 20 et 21, ubi docet, papam hæreticum manifestum non esse ipso facto depositum, sed deponi posse, ac debere deponi ab ecclesia: quæ

wits' ends, not knowing what to affirm, nor what to deny. For first, there are some among them that think that the pope, though he violate all laws divine and human, though he become publicly scandalous, and therein show himself incorrigible, yea, though he be a professed and damnable heretic; yet neither is deposed *ipso facto*, by the sentence of the canon, nor may be deposed by all the men in the world. Which opinion if we admit to be true, the condition of the Church, the beloved spouse of Christ and mother of us all, is most woful and miserable, in that hereby she is forced to acknowledge a devouring wolf, making havoc of the sheep of Christ redeemed with his precious blood, to be her pastor and guide. Secondly, some are of opinion, that the pope, if he become an open and professed heretic, is deposed *ipso facto*, by the sentence of the canon, and that the Church may declare that he is so deposed. Thirdly, there are that think that an heretical pope is not deposed *ipso facto*, but that he may be deposed by the Church. Fourthly, many worthy divines in the Roman Church heretofore have been of opinion, that the Church or general council may depose the pope, not only for heresy, but also for other enormous crimes. Of this opinion was cardinal Cusanus¹, cardinal Cameracensis², Gerson chan-

sententia meo iudicio defendi non potest. Nam inprimis, quod hæreticus manifestus ipso facto sit depositus probatur auctoritate et ratione.

“Deinde quod secundo Cajetanus dicit posse papam hæreticum ab ecclesia deponi vere et ex auctoritate non minus videtur falsa quam primum. Nam si ecclesia invitum papam deponit certe est supra papam, cujus oppositum in illo tractatu Cajetanus defendit.

“Secundo, deponi invitum a pontificatu sine dubio est pœna, igitur ecclesia invitum papam deponens sine dubio ipsum punit; at punire est superioris et iudicis.

“Tertio, quia secundum Cajetanum et cæteros Thomistas, re idem sunt totum et partes simul sumptæ, igitur qui habet auctoritatem in partes simul sumptas ita ut eas separare possit habet etiam in ipsum totum, quod ex partibus illis consurgit.”—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 30. [Tom. I. p. 344.]

¹ “Papa per synodum in criminibus etiam aliis quam hæresi iudicari potest.”—Nicol. de Cusa, De Concord. Cathol. Lib. II. cap. 17. [p. 737.]

² “Sicut concilium Pisanum, ita et aliud concilium in aliquo casu esse potest supra papam, et potest eum deponere.”—[Petrus de Alliaco] Cameracensis, in Concil. Constant. [Inter Opp. Gerson. Tom. II. col. 953, Antv. 1706.]

cellor of Paris¹, Almain, and all the Parisians, with all the worthy bishops and divines in the councils of Constance and Basil². Yet the papists at this day for the most part dislike and condemn this opinion, and acknowledge no deposition of any pope, how ill soever, unless it be for heresy. And Bellarmine (to make all sure) telleth us farther, that the Church doth not by any authority depose an heretical pope, but whereas he is deposed *ipso facto*, in that he falleth into heresy, only declareth the same; and thereupon largely refuteth the opinion of cardinal Cajetan³, who thinketh that the pope when he falleth into heresy, is not deposed *ipso facto*, but that deserving to be deposed, the Church doth truly, and out of her authority, depose him. First, because (as he saith) if the Church or council may depose the pope from his papal dignity, against his will, for what cause soever, it will follow that the Church is above the pope, which yet Cajetan denieth. For as it will follow, that the pope is above other bishops, and of more authority than they, if he may depose them; so if the council of bishops may depose the pope, they are greater than he. Secondly, he saith, to be put from the papacy unwillingly, is a punishment; so that if the Church may depose the pope, though unwilling to leave his place, it may punish him, and consequently is above him. For he that hath power to punish, hath the place of a superior and judge. Thirdly, he that may restrain and limit a man in the use and exercise of his ministry and office, is in authority above him; therefore much more he that may put him from it. By these reasons it is clearly demonstrated and proved, that if the Church or general council have authority in case of heresy to depose the pope, at least in some sort, it is of greater authority than the pope. And therefore to avoid this consequence (as Gerson⁴

¹ "Auferibilis est vicarius sponsus ecclesiæ per ecclesiam aut generale concilium."—Gerson. De Auferibilitate Papæ, Consid. xvi. [Tom. II. col. 219.]

² Vid. Act. Concil. Constantiens. et Basiliens. [Apud Labbe, Tom. XVI. et XVII.]

³ Cajet. in tract. de Authorit. Pap. et Conc. Chap. xx. et xxi. [Vid. not. supra.]

⁴ "Una opinio ponit quod papa dum labitur in hæresim jam damnatam est eo facto per Deum depositus et perdit jure divino papalem dignitatem, sive hæc hæresis sit secreta ut ampliant aliqui, sive sit manifesta, ut placet aliis loqui restrictius."—Gerson. ubi supra.

rightly noteth) they that too much magnify the greatness and amplitude of papal power, say that an heretical pope, in that he is an heretic, ceaseth to be pope, and is deposed by Almighty God. So that the Church doth not by virtue of her authority and jurisdiction depose him, but only denounce and declare that he is so deposed by God, and to be taken for such a one by men, and not to be obeyed. This they endeavour to prove, because all "heretics are condemned by their own judgment¹," as the apostle saith, and stay not, as other evil-doers, till the Church cast them out, but voluntarily depart of themselves from the fellowship of God's people, and cut themselves off from the unity of the body of the Church; thereby ceasing to be members of it, and consequently losing all authority and command they formerly had. For the clearing of this point, we are to observe, that there are some who run into errors so directly contrary to all Christianity, and the sense and judgment of all Christians, that by the very proposing thereof they abandon and drive from them all such as dissent, and are abandoned of all. Secondly, there are some that run not into errors so directly contrary to the sense and judgments of all Christians as the former, but with such fury, madness, and pertinacy, that they utterly reject, forsake, and depart from all such as do dissent, or are otherwise minded. Thirdly, there are some who though they be not carried with such violent fury into error, as to condemn, reject, and depart from all that dissent, yet they run into old heresies formerly condemned, and so by force of the former condemnation are rejected, and put out of the lap and bosom of the Church. Fourthly, there are some who fall into heretical and dangerous errors, but neither directly contrary to the common sense of all right believing Christians, nor formerly condemned by the consenting voice of the whole Church of God, nor with such pertinacy, as either to refuse to communicate with them that think otherwise, or to seek to deprive, depose, degrade, or otherwise violently vex and molest them that are under them, for not consenting to them in their error. The three former sorts of men falling into error and heresy, voluntarily cut themselves off from the unity of the body of the Church, depart from the fellowship of God's people, and *ipso facto* cease to be members of the Church, and lose all authority and command

¹ Titus iii. 11.

they formerly had. So that they need not the Church's censure or sentence to cast them out, departing of themselves; but it sufficeth that their breaches and divisions from the main body of the Christian Church be published and made known, that so they may be avoided. So Cœlestinus¹ in his epistle to John of Antioch saith, that if any one have been excommunicated, or deprived by Nestorius, or any of his adherents, since the time they first began to publish their impieties, he still continueth in the communion of his Churches, neither doth he judge him to be removed from his place: and the like he hath in his epistle to the clergy of Constantinople². But the fourth sort of men erring, do not cease to be members of the Church, nor lose their places by so erring, till both the point of doctrine wherein they are deceived be tried and examined, and by lawful and highest authority be found faulty: and their pertinacy such, as rather to suffer themselves to be rejected, and put from the communion of all that are otherwise minded, than to alter their judgments. Cyprian³ fell into an heretical opinion, that the baptism of heretics is void, and that all that have been baptized by heretics are to be rebaptized. Yet because this point was not examined and condemned in a general council, nor his pertinacy therein upon such examination and condemnation, found such, as rather to suffer himself to be rejected from the communion of all them that thought otherwise, than to give way and alter his judgment, he was no heretic, neither did he lose his place of ministry in the

¹ “Εἴ τις δὲ ἢ ἀπὸ Νεστορίου ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν αὐτῷ ἐξακολουθησάντων ἀφ’ οὗ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἤρξατο λαλεῖν ἢ ἀκοινώνητος ἐγένετο, ἐγυμνώθη τῆς τοῦ ἱερέως ἀξίας, ἢ τῆς τοῦ κληρικοῦ, τοῦτον ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ μεμενηκέναι καὶ μένειν εἰς τὸ ἐξῆς ὡμολόγηται.”—Cœlest. Papa, inter Act. Concil. Ephes. Tom. i. cap. 15. [Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 926.]

² “Φανερώς ἡ αὐθεντία τοῦ ἡμετέρου θρόνου ὥριστο μηδένα ἢ ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ κληρικόν, ἢ κατὰ τι ἐπάγγελμα Χριστιάνον, τῶν παρὰ Νεστορίου ἢ τῶν τούτου ὁμοίων ἀφ’ οὗ τοιαῦτα κηρύττειν ἤρξαντο, ἢ τοῦ ἰδίου τόπου ἢ τῆς κοινωνίας ἀποκηθέντων δοκεῖν ἢ ἀποκεκινήσθαι ἢ ἀποκοινώνητον γεγενῆσθαι.”—Ibid. [col. 924.]

³ “Illis temporibus antequam plenarii concilii sententia quid in hac re sequendum esset totius ecclesiæ consensus confirmasset, visum est Cypriano cum ferme octoginta co-episcopis suis Africanarum ecclesiarum, omnem hominem qui extra ecclesiæ catholicæ communionem baptizatus fuisset oportere ad ecclesiam venientem denuo baptizare. . . . Non se ille tamen a cæteris diverse sentientibus separata communione disjunxit.”—August. De Baptismo, Lib. i. cap. 18. [Tom. ix. col. 93.]

Church of God. The question therefore is, whether if the pope fell into such an error as that of Cyprian, by which he doth not actually and *ipso facto* divide and cut off himself, the Church may examine it, and judge him to be rejected, and put from the communion, if he alter not his judgment. If they say it may, then hath the Church power to judge a pope that is not an heretic. For he is not an heretic till after such determination; he chooseth rather to be rejected from the communion of the faithful, than to alter his judgment. If it may not judge the pope so erring, then might the popes in former times have taught rebaptization with Cyprian; the error of the Chiliasts, with sundry of the fathers; "that all right believers, how wickedly soever they live, shall in the end be saved," with some of the ancient; that the just shall not see God till the resurrection, and the like: and yet the Church have had no power to force them to forsake and condemn such errors, or to cease from persuading and inducing men, both by doctrine and example, to err in like sort. And then we may run into their error, who think, that though the pope be an heretic, yet he is neither deposed *ipso facto*, nor may be deposed, but that the Church must acknowledge a devouring wolf making havoc of the flock of Christ, to be her pastor; which Bellarmine himself thinketh to be very absurd. Thus then we see, that all who fall into heresies, do not cut off themselves from the unity of the body of the Church, nor lose the jurisdiction and authority they formerly had, *ipso facto*, as the papists (to avoid the deposing of popes by the authority of the Church) seem to imagine; but that many do so fall into heresies, that they go not out of themselves till they be rejected and cast out. But howsoever, our adversaries must not defend that popes falling into heresies are deposed *ipso facto*, for if they do, they overthrow the whole building and fabric of popery. The constant opinion of almost all later papists is¹, that howsoever the pope may

¹ "Ipse tanquam pontifex non potest unquam docere aliquid contra fidem, sive ut in sede ejus nunquam inveniretur qui doceret contra veram fidem."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 3. [p. 394.]

"Media et vera sententia est Romanum pontificem ut privata persona est tam in fide esse defectibilem quam in moribus peccabilem; sed ut publica persona est, id est, quando de fide consultus ex officio respondet et decernit, hæreticum dogma nec unquam hactenus tradidisse, nec tradere posse. Hæc media veritas est nunc apud catholicos

personally err and fall into heresy, or become an heretic, yet the providence of God over him is such, (because he is Christ's vicar, Peter's successor, heir of the apostles, and head of the universal Church,) that he cannot define or decree any heresy, or prescribe unto all Christians to believe amiss. Which conceit cannot stand, but falleth to the ground, and is clearly overthrown, if the pope by becoming an heretic be deposed *ipso facto*. For doubtless if the pope becoming an heretic *ipso facto* cease to be pope, and to be so much as a member of the Church, then doth not the prayer of Christ for the not failing of Peter's faith extend to him any longer, neither is he any longer any way privileged, by virtue of his succeeding blessed Peter, but that he may run into all extremities in most damnable sort, seek to subvert the faith, to force all to believe as he doth, and define and determine that all shall profess the same doctrine of devils that himself doth; seeing when God forsaketh him, and putteth him out of his protection, the devil entereth into him as he did into Judas the traitor. And how violent and strange the movings of the evil spirit are, we are not ignorant: for "sometimes he casteth them that are possessed by him into the fire, and sometimes into the water¹:" sometimes into one extremity, and sometimes into another. Wherefore either the papists must confess that the pope may define for heresy, and then all their religion is overthrown: or else they must acknowledge that he is not deposed *ipso facto* by becoming an heretic, but that he is to be deposed by the authority of the Church, and so make the Church of greater authority than the pope: and then they are in worse case than before. For then, as the Church by her authority censureth him for heresy, lest he subvert the faith, mislead the people of God, and overthrow religion: so she may likewise censure him in other cases for the avoiding of the like danger; seeing such may be his prodigious and hellish conversation, and his execrable corruption and violence in doing wrong, in perverting justice, in turning judgment into worm-

et recepta etsi non de fide. Et contrarium sustinere esset assertio erronea, scandalosa, et offensiva, etsi fortasse non hæretica. Est nunc recepta et communis, quia non solum veteres scholastici doctores, sed et moderni scriptores illam sustinent et docent."—Stapleton. Relect. Controv. iii. Quæst. 4. [Tom. i. p. 706, Par. 1620.]

¹ Mark ii. 22.

wood, in violating all laws and canons, in overthrowing the jurisdiction of all other bishops, and in making a scorn of all religion, as may be as hurtful to the Church as heresy. Now that we speak not of an impossible or strange thing, or never heard of before, when we speak of monsters, prodigious and hellish monsters, intruding themselves by sinister means into the holy chair of blessed Peter, let the reader peruse the histories¹ written of the popes, by their own friends, and by the lovers of the Church of Rome, which are full of the villanies of this kind of men, in which nothing is more ordinary, or more often repeated, than those honourable titles of most wicked popes, *Monstra, teterrima monstra*: “monsters, most hideous and ugly monsters.” Let him cast his eyes upon the fifty popes mentioned by Genebrard² (that vassal of the pope, and sworn enemy of all honest and good men), which are by him acknowledged to have been monsters, and apostatical, rather than apostolical: and among them upon that monster of monsters, John the Twelfth, than whom a viler hell-hound never breathed upon the earth, and who seemed to be a very devil incarnate.

Wherefore let us pass from the case of heresy, to see whether the pope may not be deposed for other enormous crimes publicly scandalous. The chief and principal reason brought by our adversaries, to prove that he may not be judged of any, whatsoever he do, is because he hath sovereign authority over all, and is prince of the whole Church. But this reason (as Bellarmine³ confesseth) is *Petitio principii*, that is, a gross begging of that which is in question; and besides, they who bring this proof, run round in a circle, and make themselves giddy by sophistical circulation. For thus they dispute. The pope hath an absolute sovereignty over

¹ Platina in Joann. x. [Al. xi. p. 150.] Benedict. iv. Sergio iii. et Christophoro i. [p. 147.] Sigon. De Regno Italiæ, Lib. vi. In Vita Formosi. [Tom. ii. col. 359, Mediol. 1732.]

² “Hoc sæculum uno infelix quod per annos fere 150, pontifices 50, a Joanne scilicet 8, ad Leonem 9, usque... a virtute majorum prorsus defecerint.”—Genebrard. Chronol. Lib. iv. Sæc. 10. [p. 546, Par. 1600.]

³ “Quia hæc ratio assumit id quod in tota hac disputatione probare nitimur, viz. Romanum pontificem principem esse totius ecclesiæ, idcirco hac et similibus rationibus prætermisissis ex testimoniis conciliorum, pontificum, imperatorum, ac doctorum ecclesiæ demonstrabimus Romanum præsulem judicari non posse.”—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. ii. cap. 26. [p. 337.]

all, and is prince of the whole Church, because no man may judge him; and if any man doubt whether he may be judged or not, they prove full wisely that he may not, because he hath an absolute sovereignty. Wherefore the cardinal leaveth the proving of this point by reason, and undertaketh to demonstrate the same by authorities. But they are such as are not much to be esteemed. For either they prove not the point in question, or else they may justly be suspected of forgery and corruption.

The first testimony he allegeth¹ is out of the council of Sinuessa, which was called (as it is supposed) by the clergy of Rome, in the time of Dioclesian the emperor, to examine the fact of Marcellinus, that had sacrificed unto idols. Of the acts of this council, Binius in his annotations upon the same, in the first tome of the councils, saith: that very many of the best learned divines do think them to be mere counterfeits, and of no esteem or credit, and that they were but the device of the Donatists, seeking to blemish the blessed memory of Marcellinus, whom all antiquity much esteemed and honoured. Whereupon Saint Augustine² saith, that certain Donatists objected the fall of Marcellinus to the catholics, but that they could never yet prove any such crime to have been committed by him as they charged him with. Howsoever there are many most strong and forcible arguments to prove that the acts of this council are mere forgeries. For first, whereas this council is said to have been holden at Sinuessa, in a certain vault or cave under the ground, that was named the vault or cave of Cleopatra, there is no history, nor no writer that

¹ "Probatur ergo primo ex conciliis. In concilio Sinuessano dicunt patres: 'Prima sedes a nemine judicabitur.'"—Ibid. [Vid. Concil. apud Labbe, Tom. i. col. 962.]

"Quanquam virorum doctissimorum plurimi hæc acta spuria et nullius ponderis esse validis sane argumentis probare conati sint, adeoque nihil esse sentiant quam commentum a Donatistis callide excogitatum ut scil. Marcellini nomen infamaretur."—[Bin. Annot. apud Labbe, ibid. col. 963.]

² "Marcellinus et presbyteri ejus, Melchiades, Marcellus, et Sylvester traditionis codicum divinorum et thurificationis ab eo crimine arguuntur: sed numquid ideo etiam convincuntur, aut convicti aliqua documentorum firmitate monstrantur? Ipse sceleratos et sacrilegos fuisse dicit, ego innocentes fuisse respondeo."—August. De Unico Baptismo contra Petil. cap. 16. [Tom. ix. col. 541.]

mentioneth any such cave, nor any man that can tell of any the least memorial of any such thing. Neither doth that answer satisfy men, that many famous cities have been made desolate by earthquakes, and many mountains and plains have changed both their situation, place, and name. For howsoever they lost their old names, and are called by new, yet their old names remain still in those ancient writers, wherein formerly they were; but the name of this cave or vault cannot be found in any ancient writer whatsoever. Secondly, it is very strange, that in the time of Dioclesian, when the persecution was hottest, and the flame of that fire consumed and wasted all that came near it, three hundred bishops should be assembled together, and meet in such a cave, whereinto they could not all enter, and so hide themselves, but only fifty at a time, leaving the rest abroad to be spied and apprehended: than which what can be more unlikely? For they are reported to have made choice of a cave to meet in, that by hiding themselves they might decline the fury of their bloody enemies, and yet this cave is described to have been in a city, and of so small receipt and narrow compass, that only fifty could enter into it at a time. So that two hundred and fifty were always in open view abroad in the city. Thirdly, in the accusation that is brought against Marcellinus, it is said, that Dioclesian brought him into the temple of Vesta and Isis, and that he caused him to sacrifice to Saturn and Jupiter; whereas it is certain that diverse gods and goddesses among the heathen had their diverse temples, so that they never used to sacrifice to Jupiter in the temple of Vesta, or to Vesta in the temple of Jupiter or Mars. Fourthly, the author of the Pontifical saith, Marcellinus did sacrifice, and a few days after repenting of that he had done, was martyred. Now how three hundred bishops in so few days could be brought together, I think neither the authors nor the patrons of these forgeries can easily tell us. These and the like reasons are brought by Cardinal Baronius¹ and others, who (thinking that to acknowledge that Marcellinus did sacrifice to idols, doth more disadvantage their cause, than any thing decreed in it doth help it), incline to say, that the acts of this council are counterfeit, and that all these things were

¹ Vid. Baron. Annal. Tom. II. A. D. 303, n. c. et sqq. [p. 757, sq. Antv. 1617.]

devised by the enemies of the see apostolic. But others thinking that the fact of this pope may be excused, and supposing that the decree of this council, that "the first see is to be judged of none," may much help their helpless cause, and for¹ that otherwise they shall be driven to discredit it, their Martyrologies, and their Breviaries, and pope Nicholas the First, who urgeth the saying of these supposed bishops in his Epistle to Michael the emperor; admit this council as if it were of credit, and urge the authority of it to confirm things questioned between them and us; though they be not able to answer the reasons of the other side, to the satisfaction of any indifferent man: for this is the manner of these jesuited papists, to reject or admit nothing otherwise than as they think it may make for them or against them. But to leave them thus striving and contending one with another, and to come to the saying alleged by Bellarmine out of this supposed council, it no way maketh for them, but against them, and cannot stand with the grounds of their own divinity, unless they will be of their opinion, who think that the Church must endure an heretical pope, and that he must be still taken to be a shepherd of the sheep of Christ, though as a devouring wolf, he make havoc of the flock of Christ. For is not infidelity as bad as heresy? And did not Marcellinus as much endanger the Church of Rome, and the religion of Christians, in making friendship with Dioclesian, by sacrificing to his idols, as Liberius did by subscribing to the Arians' wicked proceedings against Athanasius, and communicating with heretics? Was it lawful for the clergy of Rome, upon the knowledge of Liberius his fact, to depose him; and might not the same clergy, assisted with three hundred bishops, judge and depose Marcellinus? But here we may see the partiality of these papists, and that they write without all conscience. For Bellarmine² being to justify Felix to be a

¹ Bin. Annot. in Conc. Sinuessanum. [cit. supra.]

² "Constat eo tempore Felicem schismaticum papam, non verum et legitimum pontificem fuisse: duo siquidem simul esse non possunt, vivebat autem tunc et verus pontifex erat Liberius. Quocirca nemo catholicorum Romæ cum Felice eo tempore communicare volebat.

"Post biennium deinde successit lapsus Liberii: tunc vero Romanus clerus abrogata Liberio pontificia dignitate ad Felicem contulit, quem catholicum esse sciebat; et ex eo tempore cœpit Felix verus

true pope, who possessed the place while Liberius lived, saith, that in his entrance he was a schismatic, (Liberius yet living, and continuing a catholic bishop,) but that after the fall of Liberius, for which the Church did lawfully depose him, he was by the same Church admitted and taken for a true bishop: yea, though Liberius were not in heart an heretic, but was presumed to be an heretic, only because he made peace with the Arians, and so was an heretic in his outward courses and acts, of which men are to judge, and not of the heart. And yet touching Marcellinus, he saith¹, he thinketh he lost not his popedom, nor might not be deposed from it for that most execrable extern act of idolatry and infidelity, because it might be thought he did it out of fear. Shall the uncertain conjecture of the motive that made him do so vile an act, excuse him from being proceeded against, as an infidel that doth the works of an infidel? and shall not the like conjectures stay the proceedings against men as heretics, upon their outward concurring with heretics in some things? Shall fear excuse Marcellinus? and shall not the impatience of Liberius (no longer able to endure such intolerable vexations as he was subject to) excuse him? was it not as strongly presumed that impatience moved the one to do that he did, as fear the other? Yes, surely much more. For if we may believe the acts of this feigned council, Marcellinus was rather won with flattery and fair promises, than forced with terrors; the emperor seeking to win him with kindness, and not to force him with severity and extremity, being persuaded by Alexander and Romanus so to do. For that if he could insinuate himself into the affection of the bishop, and assure him unto himself, he might thereby easily gain the whole city. Thus having examined the first testimony produced by the Romanists to prove that the bishops of the Roman see may not be judged, and found it to be of no credit, let us see if the next will be any better.

The next is taken out of the Roman council under pope Sylvester, consisting of two hundred and eighty-four bishops,

pontifex esse. Tametsi enim Liberius hæreticus non erat, tamen habebatur propter pacem cum Arianis factam hæreticus."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 9. [p. 404.]

¹ "Marcellinus nec docuit aliquid contra fidem, nec fuit hæreticus, vel infidelis, nisi actu externo ob metum mortis."—Id. cap. 8. [p. 402.]

wherein we find these words: *Neque ab Augusto, neque a regibus, neque ab omni clero, neque a populo judicabitur prima sedes*¹: that is, "The first see shall not be judged neither by Augustus, neither by kings, neither by the whole clergy, neither by the people." Before we come to answer this authority, we must observe, that many things are most fondly and fabulously devised and attributed to this Sylvester, under whom this imagined Roman council is supposed to have been holden. For whereas Eusebius², Sozomen³, and other historians of credit, report, that the conversion of Constantine the Great was partly out of those good lessons he had learned of his father, and partly by a strange apparition of the sign of the cross, with an inscription in it, *In hoc vince*, that is, "In this overcome," appearing to him in the air when preparing himself to the war against Maxentius, he carefully bethought himself to what God he should betake him, and whose help among the gods he should specially seek; and partly by a vision of Christ appearing to him: whereupon he sent for the priests of that God that had so manifested himself unto him, and learned of them what God he was. Those fond men⁴ that published the feigned acts of Sylvester report, that Constantine after many horrible murders of his nearest kinsmen, and the parricide of his own son Crispus, being stricken with leprosy, was wished by the soothsayers, to whom he sought for counsel and advice, to take the blood of innocents, and to bathe himself in it for the curing of his leprosy; but that discouraged from the effusion thereof by the piteous cries of their tender mothers, he bethought himself better, and sought expiation of his grievous crimes, which all other denying to him for so grievous offences, Hosius of Corduba told him that the Christians could purge him, and Peter and Paul appearing to him, told him he must recal Sylvester out of his hiding-place, whither he was gone for fear, and seek bap-

¹ Concil. Roman. sub Sylvestr. cap. xx. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 1589.]

² Euseb. de Vita Constantini, Lib. i. capp. 20—26. [Al. 27—32.]

³ Sozomen. H. E. Lib. i. cap. 3.

⁴ Vide Acta Sylvestri quæ extant in Epist. quadam decretali, Tom. ii. Epist. Pontif. [Vid. etiam Surium, in die 31 Decembr. Tom. vi. p. 1052, sqq.] Item Act. i. Concil. Nicæn. ii. [Epist. Hadrian. Labbe, Tom. viii. col. 747, sq. Baron. Ann. 324, num. 32 et sq. [Tom. v. p. 40, Luc. 1739.] Et Binium in notis in Vita Sylvestri. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 1439, 40.]

tism of him; and that then he should be purged both from the impurity of his soul and body; which accordingly was done, and he recovered. In thankful requital whereof he cast down the temples of the false gods, builded many Christian churches, and gave to Sylvester the city of Rome, with all Italy, and many other provinces besides, making him temporal lord of all those places. Whereas it is most certain, that Constantine was not baptized till a little before his death, as it appeareth by Eusebius¹, by Hierome², and by the synodal epistle of the council of Ariminum, written to Constantius, reported by Theodoret³, Socrates⁴, and Sozomen⁵; and as certain that Constantine was a Christian emperor before Sylvester was bishop. For⁶ in the days of Melchiades his predecessor, he took notice of the differences among bishops, in respect of Cæcilianus, and rested not till he had composed them; professing that he so honoured the catholic Church, that he could not endure any schism to be in it. Notwithstanding, the same authors of lies go forward, and tell us, after the baptism of Constantine by Sylvester, of a council holden at Rome by the same Sylvester, consisting of two hundred and eighty-four bishops, brought thither, and maintained there at the emperor's charges. But there are many things that bewray it to be a mere counterfeit. For first it hath a senseless title; for it is named another Roman council under Sylvester the First, whereas no man can tell of any besides this. Secondly, it is fronted with a brief epilogue instead of a preface. Thirdly, there is scarce any sense to be made of any one sentence throughout the whole. Fourthly, it is said to consist of one hundred and thirty-nine bishops out of the city of Rome, or not far from it, and the rest out of Greece; whereas all men know the city of Rome had but one bishop, so that it was senseless to say, there were in that council one hundred and thirty-nine bishops out of the city of Rome, or not far from it. And besides, all men see how silly a thing it was to muster so many names of bishops, without specifying the places whereof they were bishops. Fifthly,

¹ Euseb. Lib. iv. de Vita Constantini, capp. 61, 62.

² Hieronym. in Chronico. [Tom. viii. col. 789.]

³ Theodor. Hist. Lib. ii. cap. 25. [Al. 19.]

⁴ Socrates, Lib. ii. cap. 29. [Al. 37.]

⁵ Sozom. Lib. iv. cap. 17.

⁶ Euseb. Hist. Lib. x. cap. 5.

whereas it is said to have consisted of two hundred and eighty-four bishops out of the city of Rome, and places near to it, and out of Greece, as if it had been a general council; it is strange that the histories reporting far meaner councils than this is supposed to have been, should never make any mention of this, nor the occasion of calling it. Sixthly, whereas the supposed fathers of this council do condemn (though in very senseless manner) certain unknown heretics, it is strange they should make no mention of the Arians, who were famous, and at that time troubled all the East¹. Seventhly, the end why these supposed fathers met was ridiculous. For thus it is expressed: *Ut Ecclesiæ regiæ non vaticinentur, sed sit firma, et claudat ostium propter persecutorem*². Or, as another edition hath it, *Ut Ecclesia regia non vacilletur, sed sit firma, et claudat ostium propter persecutorem*. For why should these good men forbid the kingly Churches to prophesy? or why should they fear the shaking or tottering of them? or shut the door for fear of the persecutor, after Constantine was become a Christian, baptized by Sylvester, and, in requital of his kindness, had given him all the empire of the West? Lastly, whereas the manner of councils was that the bishops sat round in a compass, the presbyters sat behind them, and the deacons stood before them, the council of Carthage³ forbiddeth a bishop to sit, and suffer a presbyter to stand: and Hierome⁴ sheweth, that even in Rome the manner was, that presbyters did sit, and deacons stand: here it is noted, that none sat but bishops. These things being observed touching the credit of this council, let us come to the decrees of it, by which the pope would exempt himself from all judgment of men, whatsoever villanies he should chance to commit. Thus then the decrees of this sacred synod are passed in favour of the pope. First it is decreed⁵, “that no presbyter *a die onus presbyterii* (Latin fitter for hogherds than bishops) shall marry, and that if he do, he shall lose his honour for twelve years.” Secondly, it is

¹ This council was holden after the ending of the Nicene council, if we may believe the epilogue before it.

² Cap. 1. [Labbe, col. 1581, 2.]

³ Concil. Carthag. iv. Canon xxxiv. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1440.]

⁴ Hieron. Epist. lxxxv. ad Evagrium. [Chap. xxv. p. 199, supra.]

⁵ Cap. 19. [col. 1587.]

ordered thus¹: "That if any one shall do against this present handwriting, he shall be condemned for ever. For let no man judge the first see: for neither shall the judge be judged of Augustus, nor of all the clergy, nor of kings, nor people." These senseless decrees of a feigned and ridiculous synod our adversaries (such is their poverty in this cause) bring forth, as good authorities for the pope. But I think the reader will not much be moved with them, unless it be to pity those that lived before us, who were abused with such fooleries and shameless forgeries, and to give thanks to God, that hath given us means to descry the cozening devices of Satan's agents. Neither doth it anything assure us of the truth of this council, that pope Nicholas was content to make use of it in his epistle to Michael the emperor of Constantinople, seeing he citeth also in the same epistle the Roman synod under Sixtus the Third, in the cause of Polychronius bishop of Jerusalem, whereas yet notwithstanding Binius² saith confidently, that every learned man will pronounce the acts of it to be counterfeit, if he attend the names of the consuls in whose times it is supposed to have been holden, the name of him that was accused, and other things described in those supposed and pretended acts.

To these they add another authority (as it may seem) of the same stamp, out of the council³ of Rome under Sixtus the Third, which they endeavour to strengthen with certain sayings out of a book of one Evodius, a deacon, admitted, and allowed in the fifth council under Symmachus. The Roman council under Sixtus was called to examine a very foul fact, wherewith Sixtus was charged, which was the abusing of one Chrysogonet, a professed and consecrated virgin. In this council Sixtus presented himself, and professed that it was in his power and choice either to submit himself to the judgment of the council, or to refuse it; and yet voluntarily referred his cause to be there heard: whence our adversaries suppose

¹ Cap. 19 and 20. [ibid.]

² "Eadem acta spuria et illegitima esse quivis prudens asseruerit, si ad notam consularem, nomen accusati, aliasve res apud acta descriptas diligenter attendat."—Bin. Annot. ad acta synodalia accusat. et expurg. Polychronii. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 524.]

³ "Respondit Sixtus et dixit, 'Quanquam in meo arbitrio sit judicer, an non judicer, tamen meo iudicio non abscondatur veritas.'"—Concil. Rom. sub Sixto III. [Cap. 5. Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 513.]

they may infer that all the world may not judge the pope against his will. The barbarisms and manifold senseless absurdities that are found in this council, may justly make us suspect it of forgery. But admitting it to have been a lawful synod, no such thing can be concluded out of it as our adversaries dream of. For it was but a diocesan synod, and there was never a bishop in it, besides Sixtus, whom they went about to judge. And therefore it was not to be marvelled at if Sixtus said, it was in his power and choice whether he would be judged by the presbyters and deacons of his own Church, or not; seeing no bishop, be he never so mean, may be judged by the clergy of his own Church, but by the synod of the bishops of the province; and therefore I greatly fear they will hardly draw a good argument from hence, to prove that the pope may not at all be judged. For I think it will not follow: Maximus the ex-consul said, it was not lawful for those laymen, and inferior clergymen then assembled, to give sentence against the bishop of Rome; and the bishop himself protested that he might choose whether he would be judged by them or not: therefore the whole Christian world may not judge the pope. Wherefore let us come to the sayings of Evodius, and see whether they confirm the Romish conceit any better. The occasion of the writing of this book of Evodius, was this: Symmachus¹, the bishop of Rome, being charged with certain grievous crimes, was to be judged in a synod called by Theodoricus the king, not without his own consent. To this council he was willing to come, and to submit himself to the judgment of it; only he desired restitution of such things as had been taken from him, till he were convicted: which he could not obtain, and yet presented himself in the synod. But such was the fury and violence of his enemies pressing in upon him, that he was in very great danger of his life; and therefore, after the first time, would come no more to the place where the bishops sat. Whereupon they not knowing what to do (for it was not fit to judge him being absent, and there was no reason to proceed against him as contumacious in refusing to come unto them, seeing his refusal seemed to proceed from just fear of danger), utterly refused and disclaimed the trying of his cause, and the judg-

¹ Synod. Roman. iii. [Al. iv.] sub Symmacho. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 491.]

ing of it; moved not a little so to do, because great multitudes of the people communicated with him, and they had no precedent of such proceedings against former bishops. The king, somewhat offended herewith, told them, that if they did not discuss the cause, they would give an ill example to all bishops to live wickedly, and at their pleasure, in hope of impunity; and yet left the matter wholly to them, who did nothing in it, but only persuaded to unity. Hereupon there grew some distraction among the clergy and people of Rome, and some thought the bishops had done ill in leaving the matter unexamined. Upon which occasion one Evodius a deacon writeth a book in defence of their proceedings, which they approve in their fifth synod or meeting, wherein among other things he hath these words: *Lex probitatis et mentis est, quæ hominem viventem sine lege castigat: proprie moribus impendit qui necessitati non debet disciplinam. Aliorum forte hominum causas Deus voluit homines terminare, sed sedis istius præsulis suo sine quæstione reservavit arbitrio. Voluit beati Petri Apostoli successores cælo tantum debere innocentiam, et sublimissimi discussoris indagini inviolatam exhibere conscientiam*: that is, "The law of virtue and of the mind keepeth them in awe, who live without any other law. He that is not otherwise inforced to live well, will live orderly for the love of order and good life. Haply God would have the causes of other men ended by men, but the causes of the bishop of this see he reserved no doubt to his own judgment: and his pleasure was, that the successors of blessed Peter should be accountable for their good or ill living to heaven only, and present and exhibit their consciences kept inviolable to the examination of the most exquisite examiner." For answer to this allegation we say, that neither the credit of Evodius is so great, that upon his bare word we should be bound to believe him, nor the authority of these fathers such, that whatsoever they approve and allow must be holden for good. Notwithstanding, admitting these sayings to be true, their own canonists and divines in their glosses do limit and restrain them with certain exceptions¹. For first they say,

¹ "Papa cum submittit se confessori suo tenetur ei parere....Papa si efficiatur hæreticus, eo ipso non est papa, et ideo quantumcumque tunc cuperet facere justitiam esset ab alio judicandus; sed si manet verus papa, et vult facere justitiam, non debet ab aliquo judicari."—

the case of heresy must be excepted, there being no question but that the pope may be judged and condemned by men, if he become an heretic. Secondly, the case of penitential confession, wherein he yieldeth himself, as in duty bound so to do, to be judged, directed, and commanded for his soul's good, by him to whom he is pleased to reveal the estate of the same. Thirdly, the case of voluntary submission. "It is in my power," saith pope Sixtus, "to be judged or not; but let matters be examined, and the truth found out." And in like sort, Symmachus submitted himself to be judged by the council of bishops. Fourthly, the case of incorrigible wickedness, when the Church is grievously scandalized by the notorious ill life and wickedness of the pope, and he is found incorrigible in the same. This case the gloss excepteth, warranted so to do by the very light of natural reason, which teacheth us, that when any member of the body, after the cutting off whereof the body may live and continue, infecteth and endangereth the rest, and is incurable, it may and ought to be cut off. Now though the pope should in a sort be acknowledged to have the proportion of the head in the body of the Church, yet is he herein unlike unto a natural head, for that the body of the Church dieth not when he is taken away from it; and therefore to stop the deadly infection of his impiety and outrageous wickedness from spreading itself any further, he may be cut off. So that this is the only difference between the pope and other bishops, that other may be judged, though they be not incorrigible, but he is not to be judged of any other, without his own consent and concurrence, when he may be induced to reform and correct what is amiss, as being the chief of that company that is to judge of ill-doers; but if he be incorrigible, he may be proceeded against, even against his will, as we see by the example of John the Twelfth¹, who being prodigiously wicked, and after many and most earnest admonitions, intreaties and persuasions, of the emperor and others, refusing any way to

Ockam. Dialog. Part. i. Lib. vi. cap. 62. [Apud Goldast. Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp. Tom. ii. p. 567, Francof. 1614.]

¹ "Collecto a tota Italia episcoporum concilio Joannes papa de nefariis causis infamatur. Qui tertio evocatus dum se excusatum venire cunctatur, post multa tandem, eo a cunctis præjudicato, Leo adhuc laicus electione omnium et consensu imperatoris papa substi-

reform himself, the emperor called a council, and deposed him, and chose another to succeed him; and that this deposition was lawful and good, it is evident, in that the succeeding pope was holden to be a true and lawful pope while he yet lived. But concerning Gregory the pope, Henry the Third did rather persuade him to yield, and to relinquish his place, than depose him, because he found him tractable¹.

Two other authorities our adversaries have yet behind, to prove that the pope may not be judged. The first, is out of the council of Chalcedon², where the fathers, among many other reasons alleged why they condemned Dioscorus, urge this also as one, that he was so far from repenting of his manifold evil doings, that he railed against the apostolic see, sought to excommunicate blessed Leo, and persisting in his wickedness, was wilful against the whole council, and refused to answer to

tuitur."—Sigebert. Chron. Ann. 963. [In Pistorii Rer. German. Script. Tom. i. p. 817, Ratisb. 1726.]

"Albertus Berengarii filius primo Corsicam furorem principis declinans intravit; post Joannem Romanum pontificem adiens eum ad suam partem inclinavit. Eapropter Imperator obsidione castris relicta contra urbem aciem dirigit. Quidam vero ex civibus metu perculsi una cum pontifice fugiunt. Alii datis obsidibus Augusto subdantur. Otto missa legatione papam revocat: sed eo venire nolente, collecta synodo episcoporum Leontem ei in pontificatu substituit. Quod videns Albertus denuo Corsicam fugit. Quæ omnia utrum licite aut secus acta sint dicere præsentis non est operis. Res enim gestas scribere, non gestarum rerum rationem reddere proposuimus. Inveni tamen in quibusdam chronicis, sed Teutonicorum, præfatum Joannem reprehensibiliter vixisse, et frequenter super hoc ab episcopis aliisque subditis suis conventum fuisse. Cui rei durum videtur fidem accommodare, quia Romana ecclesia hoc speciale privilegium sacerdotibus suis ascribere solet, quod meritis Petri super firmam petram fundati nulla eos porta inferorum vel turbo tempestatum ad exitialem ruinam involvat."—Otho Frisingens. Chron. Lib. vi. cap. 23. [p. 119, Bas. 1569.]

¹ "Rex [Henricus III.] collecto episcoporum conventu, a pontificatu pro nota simoniæ cedere persuasit Gregorium, et Suidegerum Babenbergensem episcopum, qui et Clemens, consensu Romanæ ecclesiæ substituit."—Id. Lib. vi. cap. 32. [p. 125.]

² "Quoniam super alias suas nequitias et adversus ipsam apostolicam sedem latravit, et excommunicationis litteras adversus sanctissimum et beatissimum papam Leonem facere conatus est, ...decenter ab universali concilio sacerdotio est nudatus."—Concil. Chalced. Epist. ad Martian. et Valentin. Act. III. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1352.]

such things as he was charged with. How it will be inferred from hence that the pope may not be judged by a general council, I see not. For though it be true that the inferiors may not judge the greater and superior, and that therefore John of Antioch was condemned for judging Cyril of Alexandria, and Dioscorus for judging Leo; yet it is no way consequent that either Cyril or Leo were free from all judgment, or that they might not be judged by a general council, whatsoever they should do. The other authority is out of the Roman council under Adrian the Second, whose words recited in the eighth general council¹ are these: "We read that the Roman bishops have judged the bishops of all churches, but that any one hath judged them, we do not read." For the better understanding and clearing whereof, we must observe, first, that the person of the bishop of Rome alone is not meant, when he is said to have judged the bishops of all churches: but he must be understood to have judged them with his synod, and the bishops subject to him, as patriarch of the West. For otherwise he might not nor did not judge any bishop of himself alone. Secondly, that being bishop of the first see, he, with his associates, might judge any other bishop or patriarch, but no particular patriarch with his bishops might judge him and his, because² there is no particular person, or company of men, greater than he and his, being chief patriarch of the world: but that both he and his may be judged by a general council, it appeareth by the eighth general council, wherein the words now urged are recited. For that council³ taketh order that all the patriarchs shall

¹ "Romanum pontificem de omnium ecclesiarum præsulibus judicasse legimus; de eo vero quenuquam judicasse non legimus."—Concil. Constant. IV. General. VIII. Act. VII. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 597.]

² "Circa interrogationem discrepant literati, quibusdam dicentibus quod papa non habet superiorem in terris; aliis dicentibus, quod licet nulla persona in terris sit superior papa, universalis tamen ecclesia et concilium generale est supra papam."—Ockam. Dialog. Part. I. Lib. VI. cap. 1. [Apud Goldast. p. 507.]

³ "Definimus neminem prorsus mundi potentium quenuquam eorum qui patriarchalibus sedibus præsunt inhonorare aut movere a proprio throno tentare, sed omni reverentia et honore dignos judicare; præcipue quidem sanctissimum papam senioris Romæ, ... sed neque alium quemcunque conscriptiones contra sanctissimum papam senioris Romæ ac verba complicare et componere sub occasione quasi diffamatorum

be honoured and respected, and especially the bishop of Rome, and forbiddeth any man to compose any bills or writings against him, under pretence of some crimes, wherewith they will charge him, as Dioscorus did: but that if there be a general council, and any question be moved touching the Roman church, they may in reverent and due sort determine the same, though they may not proceed contemptuously against the Roman bishop. And so first, the council of Nice¹ gave laws, as to the other two patriarchs, so likewise to the bishop of Rome, and included him within his own bounds and limits. Secondly, the council of Chalcedon² made the bishop of Constantinople a patriarch, and the bishop of Rome's peer, notwithstanding the resistance of those that were there present on the behalf of Leo, then bishop of Rome, and the other bishops of the West. And this decree in the end prevailed, so that after much contradiction, and long-continued opposition, the bishops of Rome were forced to yield unto it. Thirdly, general councils re-examined and judged again things judged by the bishop of Rome, and his bishops³, as the council of Chalcedon re-examined the judgment of Leo against Dioscorus, and for Theodoret. And the sixth general council, the

quorundam criminum; quod et nuper Photius fecit, et multo ante Dioscorus.... Porro si synodus universalis fuerit congregata, et facta fuerit etiam de sancta Romanorum ecclesia quævis ambiguitas et controversia, oportet venerabiliter, et cum convenienti reverentia de proposita quæstione sciscitari, et solutionem accipere, aut proficere, aut profectum facere, non tamen audacter sententiam dicere contra summos senioris Romæ pontifices."—Concil. Constant. iv. General. viii. Can. 21. [Labbe, col. 646.]

¹ "Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν."—Concil. Nicæn. Can. 6. [Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 36.]

² "Χρῆναι δὲ τὸν ὀσιώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον τῆς βασιλίδος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Ῥώμης τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων τῆς τιμῆς ἀπολαύειν."—Concil. Chalced. Act. xvi. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1756.]

³ "In plenariis conciliis gesta et judicata per Romanum pontificem etiam synodice inveniuntur repetita et examinata; ut in Chalcedonensi concilio iudicium Leonis contra Dioscorum, et in sexta synodo iudicium synodicum Martini papæ contra Pyrrhum et Sergium et in octava synodo universali iudicium Nicolai et Adriani Romanorum pontificum contra Photium, cum similibus multis."—Nicol. De Cusa, De Concord. Cathol. Lib. ii. cap. 17. [p. 736.]

judgment of pope Martin, with his synods, against Pyrrhus and Sergius; and the eighth, the judgments of Nicholas and Adrian against Photius. Augustine¹, speaking of the sentence of the seventy bishops against Cæcilianus, retracted and reversed by Melchiades bishop of Rome and his colleagues (whom, upon the suits of the Donatists, Constantine appointed to hear the matter), saith they therefore appealed to the judgments of the bishops beyond the seas, that if by any falsehood and slanders they could prevail, they might gain the cause; if not they might say (as all men that have ill causes are wont to do) that they met with bad judges. "But," saith he, "let us grant that those bishops that judged the matter at Rome were not good judges; yet there remained a general council of the whole Church for them to fly unto, where the matter might anew have been handled with the former judges; that their sentences might be reversed, if they should have been convinced to have judged ill." Which thing if they did, let them make it appear unto us. We prove they did not, because all the world communicated with Cæcilianus, and not with Donatus and his adherents. So that either they never brought the matter to be scanned in a general council, or else they were therein condemned also. Here we see he clearly acknowledgeth the general council to have power to re-examine and reverse the judgment of the bishop of Rome and his colleagues. Saint Gregory² likewise

¹ "Elegerunt, sicut dicitur, *ad duas* agere causam cum Cæciliano apud ecclesias transmarinas, parati ad utrumque ut si eum potuissent quacumque versutia falsæ criminationis evincere satiarent plenissime cupiditatem suam; si autem non possent in eadem quidem perversitate durarent, sed jam tamen quasi haberent quod dicerent malos judices se esse perpressos, quæ vox est omnium malorum litigatorum cum fuerint etiam manifestissimo veritate superati, quasi non eis ad hoc dici posset et justissime dici, 'Ecce putemus illos episcopos qui Romæ judicarunt non bonos judices fuisse; restabat adhuc plenarium ecclesiæ universæ concilium, ubi etiam cum ipsis iudiciis causa posset agitari, ut si male judicasse convicti essent, eorum sententiæ solverentur. Quod utrum fecerint, probent: nos enim non factum esse facile probamus, ex eo quod totus orbis non eis communicat; aut si factum est, etiam ibi sunt victi, quod ipsa eorum separatio manifestat.'—August. Epist. clxii. [Al. Epist. xliii. cap. 7. Tom. ii. col. 96.]

² "Ego itaque per responsales meos semel et bis verbis humilibus hoc quod in tota ecclesia peccatur corripere studui. Nunc per meipsum scribo. Quidquid facere humiliter debui non omisi. Sed si in mea

acknowledgeth the universal Church to be greater than he and his. For, professing to follow the direction of Christ (in the matter between him and the bishop of Constantinople), who willeth us, if our brother offend against us, to go and admonish him between him and us; and if then he hear us not, to take two or three with us, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand; and if he hear not them, then to tell the Church; he saith, that he had first sent to the bishop of Constantinople, and by his messengers admonished him in all gentle and loving sort; and that now he writeth unto him, omitting nothing that in all humility he ought to do: but that seeing he is thus despised, there remaineth nothing but that he use the help of the Church for the repressing of the insolency of this man, so prejudicial to the state of the whole Church. Fourthly, general councils have by their decrees ordained many things concerning the see of Rome, either enlarging or limiting the power of it, and the exercise of the same, as it seemed good unto them: as we see in the council of Sardica¹. Hosius, with the bishops there assembled, resolved in the honour of the memory of Peter, to make a decree, that bishops condemned by the bishops of their own provinces might appeal to the bishop of Rome; and that it might be lawful for him upon such appeal to write to the bishops of the next province to re-examine the matter again; and if he pleased, to send some from himself to sit with them in joint commission. Neither did the bishops of Rome, Zosimus², Bonifacius, and Cœlestinus, urge the law of Christ, or the right of Saint Peter, to justify their claim of receiving appeals out of Africa, but the decrees of the Nicene council. And this is farther confirmed in that the bishops in the council of Chacedon³ say, the fathers gave the pre-eminence to the bishop of Rome in ancient times, because it was the seat of the empire, and that therefore now they would give

correptione despicior, restat ut ecclesiam debeam adhibere.—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxviii. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xxxiv. Tom. ii. col. 746.]

¹ Vid. Chap. xxxix. [pp. 374, 84. supra.]

² Ut patet in Concilio Carthag. vi. [Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 443. sqq.]

³ “Τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασιν τὰ πρεσβεῖα. Καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκόπῳ κινούμενοι οἱ ῥν. θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ.”—Concil. Chalced. Act. xvi. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1733.]

the like to Constantinople, now become the seat of the empire, and named New Rome. And as general councils gave pre-eminences to the Roman bishops, so also they restrained and limited them in the use of their jurisdiction, when they saw them to encroach too much: as the council of Sardica¹ took order that they should not meddle with the causes of presbyters and inferior clergymen upon any appeal, but leave them to their own bishops, and the synods of the provinces, and in the case of bishops appealing, not to reverse the acts of the synod of any province without another synod of the bishops of the next province. And the councils of Chalcedon² and Constantinople the Eighth³ decreed, that the bishop of Rome⁴ and the other patriarchs shall confirm the metropolitans subject unto them, by sending the pall, or by imposition of hands, but shall not intermeddle in the ordination of bishops. Fifthly, it appeareth that the Roman bishops are inferior to the whole Church; first, in that their legates⁵ rise up when they speak in general councils; and secondly, in that in the council of Ephesus⁶, when they with others were sent by the council to the emperor, they were willed precisely to follow the direc-

¹ Chap. xxxix. [pp. 374, 84. supra.]

² “Συνορώμεν πρὸ πάντων μὲν τὰ πρωτεῖα καὶ τὴν ἐξαίρετον τιμὴν κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τῷ τῆς πρεσβυτίδος Ῥώμης θεοφιλεστάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ φυλάττεσθαι· χρῆναι δὲ τὸν ὀσιώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον τῆς βασιλίδος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Ῥώμης τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων τῆς τιμῆς ἀπολαύειν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐξ αὐθεντίας ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τοῦ χειροτονεῖν τοὺς μητροπολίτας ἐν τῇ Ἀσιανῇ, καὶ Ποντικῇ, καὶ Θρακικῇ ταῖς διοικήσεσι, κ. τ. λ.”—Concil. Chalced. Act. xvi. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1756.]

³ “In Romanorum civitate hujusmodi mos prævaluit, ut eorum præsules universorum metropolitanorum qui ab ipsis promoventur, et sive per manus impositionem, sive per pallii donationem, episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant potestatem, &c.”—Concil. Constant. iv. General. viii. Can. 17. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 643.]

⁴ This council of Chalcedon speaketh only of the patriarch of Constantinople in that restraint, but making him equal with the bishop of Rome by the same canon, restraineth the one as much as the other.

⁵ “Καὶ ἀναστάντες οἱ τὸν τόπον ἐπέχοντες τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης . . . ἐξεβόησαν λέγοντες, κ. τ. λ.”—Concil. Constant. iii. General. vi. Act. 1. [Labbe, Tom. vii. col. 636.]

⁶ “Εἰδέναι δὲ βουλόμεθα τὴν ὑμετέραν ὀσιότητα, ὅτι περ εἴ τι τούτων παροφθείη παρ’ ὑμῶν, οὔτε ἡ ἀγία σύνοδος καταδέξεται τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν πραττόμενα, οὔτε ὑμᾶς ἔξει κοινωνούς.”—Concil. Ephes. Tom. iv. cap. 19. [Al. Act. vi. cap. 22. Labbe, Tom. iii. col. 1315.]

tions and instructions given them: for that if they did not, all their proceedings should be voided, and they rejected from the communion of the rest. Sixthly, in that the sixth general council particularly giveth laws to the Church of Rome. For in the thirteenth canon¹ it reprehendeth the Roman Church, because it forbiddeth presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons, to live in matrimonial society with their wives, and commandeth it to leave them to their own liberty in this behalf. And in the fifty-fifth canon² it reprehendeth the same Roman Church for fasting on Saturdays in Lent, and forbiddeth the continuing of that observation any longer. Seventhly, the pope is but a bishop, as appeareth in that he is ordained by bishops, and in that Dionysius acknowledgeth no higher dignity in the ecclesiastical hierarchy than that of a bishop³. Now all bishops, as bishops, are equal. For howsoever metropolitans in provinces, and primates or patriarchs in their larger circuits, are in all common businesses to be first sought unto, that actions of that nature may take beginning from them; yet have they no voice, neither affirmative nor negative, in determining or concluding things otherwise than as the major part of those bishops among which they are in order first shall sway them; and therefore they have not a more ample jurisdiction than other bishops; but in the administration and exercise of the power of jurisdiction common to them and other, they have the first place, and are in honour before others. Wherefore seeing the pope hath not any dignity or

¹ “Ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τάξει κανόνος παραδεδοῦσθαι διέγνωμεν τοὺς μέλλοντας διακόνου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου ἀξιουῖσθαι χειροτονίας καθομολογεῖν ὡς οὐκέτι ταῖς αὐτῶν συνάπτονται γαμεταῖς, ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἐξακολουθοῦντες κανόνι τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀκριβείας καὶ τάξεως, τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀνδρῶν κατὰ νόμους συνοικέσια καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐρρῶσθαι βουλόμεθα.”—Concil. General. VI. [Al. Quinisext. in Trullo.] Can. 13. [Labbe, col. 1352.]

² “Ἐπειδὴ μεμαθήκαμεν ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς νηστείαις τοῖς ταύτης σάββασιν νηστεύειν παρὰ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἀκολουθίαν, ἔδοξε τῇ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ, ὥστε κρατεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπαρασαλεύτως τὸν κανόνα τὸν λέγοντα· εἴ τις κληρικὸς εὗρεθείη τῇ ἀγίᾳ κυριακῇ νηστεύων, ἢ τὸ σάββατον πλὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου, καθαιρεῖσθω· εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς, ἀφοριζέσθω.”—Ibid. Can. 55. [col. 1373.]

³ “Dicimus quod omnes episcopi unius sunt potestatis, et dignitates quæ supra sunt, scilicet archiepiscopalis, patriarchalis, et papalis sunt administrationis.”—Nicol. de Cusa, Concord. Cathol. Lib. II. cap. 13. [p. 727.]

ordination ecclesiastical greater than that of a bishop, and all bishops by God's law are equal in the power of jurisdiction, howsoever in the execution and exercise thereof some be before other, there is no question to be made but that the pope is subject to some censure and judgment. Eighthly, the pope being a bishop, and the councils making laws generally to bind bishops, it is not to be doubted but that the same laws and canons do bind him. Now many of those laws and canons do deprive them that shall offend against them *ipso facto*, and other make them deprivable. Therefore he is subject to censure and judgment. To this our adversaries answer¹, that the laws and canons of general councils do not extend to the pope, but only to such as are subject to them, as inferior bishops, and such as are below the condition of bishops. But this answer is easily refuted, because the popes² anciently, at the time of their admission, did by a solemn profession bind themselves to the observation of the decrees of general councils, in as precise and strict sort as any other bishops. The form of their profession was this: *Sancta octo universalia concilia usque ad unum apicem immutilata servare, et pari honore, et veneratione digna habere, et quæ prædicaverunt et statuerunt, modis omnibus sequi et prædicare, quæque condemnaverunt, ore et corde condemnare profiteor*: that is, "I profess to keep inviolable the sacred eight general councils, even to the uttermost *iota*, and to esteem them worthy of equal honour and reverence, and by all means to follow and publish those things which they published and decreed, and to condemn with mouth and heart whatsoever things they condemned." But they will say³, per-

¹ "Respondeo, istas ipsas rationes probare non posse papam subijci canonibus, nam non habuit a patribus, sed a Christo dignitatem suam, proinde Christo non patribus subijci debet. Deinde cum ipse canones condit, signum esse eum principem et legislatorem esse: non potest autem princeps suis legibus obligari, cum non sit ipse seipso superior, et solum a superiore inferioribus leges ferantur."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 27. [p. 340.]

² Ex diurno libro. Dist. xvi. cap. 4. [Gratian. Decret. Part. I. Dist. xvi. cap. 9. col. 77, Par. 1585.]

³ Bellarm. ubi supra. "Quoad directionem, non quoad coactionem." [Adde quod papa nec patres nec eorum canones contemnit, quamvis iis cogi non possit; sed et ipse utitur iis quoad directionem, et ab aliis servari jubet.]

haps, the pope is in such sort bound to keep the laws of the Church, and the canons of general councils, that he offendeth God, and shall be punished by him if he keep them not; but that no man hath power to punish him for the not keeping of them, or to force him to keep them. And that therefore though he neglect his own salvation, and the salvation of his brethren, yea, though he draw innumerable multitudes with him into hell, there to perish everlastingly with the devil and his angels, yet no council, nor company of mortal men upon earth, may presume to censure him, unless he err from the faith, because he being to judge all, must be judged of none¹. This answer will be found very insufficient and weak; for seeing (as it is before proved) all bishops are equal in the power of jurisdiction, one hath no more power to make laws than another, neither can any one actively bind other to the observation of anything more than any other may bind him. And therefore if other bishops cannot bind the pope by their laws, he cannot bind them by his, and so by this means all shall be left free to do what they will. For it is true of all bishops that Cyprian² speaketh of himself, and the Roman bishop, that none of them severally hath power to judge other, but they are accountant only to God; yet is every bishop subject to the companies of bishops, whereof he is but a part; and if any one having none other dignity or ordination but that of a bishop, may exempt himself from being subject to the synods of bishops, every one may; and so all shall be set loose and at liberty to do what they list. But here perhaps some man will say, The metropolitans cannot be judged by the bishops of the provinces, as being in a sort heads of those companies of bishops, but by greater synods; therefore the Roman bishop,

¹ "Hujus culpas istic redarguere præsumit mortalium nullus, quia cunctos ipse judicaturus a nemine est judicandus."—Ex dictis Bonifacii, Dist. iv. [Lege xl.] 'Si Papa.' [cap. 6. col. 241.]

² "Neque quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas adigit, quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium; tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare."—Cyprian. Concil. Carthag. [p. 229, Oxon. 1682.]

"Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, cum habeat in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus."—Id. Lib. i. Epist. i. [Al. Epist. lxxii. p. 198.]

being primate of the chief part of the Christian world, as patriarch of the West, and president of a general council, as being the first among the patriarchs, is not to be judged at all, there being no greater company of bishops to judge him than those of which he is in a sort head and president. For answer whereunto, first we say, that the bishops of the provinces may judge the metropolitans in all those cases wherein their places are made void, and they put from all ecclesiastical honour *ipso facto*, by force of the canon itself, that is, they may declare that they are by the sentence of them that made the canon voided out of their places, and consequently, the bishops of the West subject to the pope, as their primate or patriarch, may judge him, that is, declare and pronounce that he is deposed by the sentence of the canon, in all such cases wherein bishops are deposed *ipso facto*. Secondly, we say, that though ordinary bishops may not be deposed without consulting the metropolitan, nor the metropolitan without consulting the patriarch, nor the patriarch of a meaner see without consulting them of greater and superior sees, because still there is an higher to whom to go; yet he that is the first and in order before all other, if by no other means he may be induced to reform himself, or voluntarily to relinquish his place (if his offence so require), may, in case of grievous and scandalous wickedness, wherein he is found incorrigible, be deposed by them that are in a sort inferior to him. Neither need this to seem strange in the deposition of bishops, seeing the same falleth out in their ordinations. For ordinary bishops may not be ordained without the metropolitans, who are in order and honour greater than they, nor metropolitans without the patriarchs, from whom they are to receive imposition of hands, or confirmation by a pall sent unto them. But the patriarchs are ordained by their own bishops, and have no imposition of hands of any that are greater than themselves, nor other confirmation than that which the meanest is to give to the greatest, as well as the greatest to the meanest. But some man will say, Is there then no difference between him that is the first among bishops, and them that are of an inferior condition? Is he no more exempted from judgment than they? Surely no: yet, as some think, there is some difference between him and them, because they may be judged, though not incorrigible; but he as being in order and honour the first, is not to be

judged, if by any other means he may be induced to reform himself, or voluntarily to relinquish his place, if his faults so require. And that in this case, as well as for heresy, the pope may be deposed, we have many of the best learned papists consenting with us: as Ockam¹, Cusanus², Cameracensis, Gerson³, Almain⁴, the bishops and divines in the councils of Constance and Basil, Driedo⁵, and, in a word, all those that think the council to be of greater authority than the pope.

CHAPTER XLI.

OF THE TITLES GIVEN TO THE POPE, AND THE INSUFFICIENCY OF THE PROOFS OF HIS ILLIMITED POWER AND JURISDICTION TAKEN FROM THEM.

SEEING the universality of the pope's power and jurisdiction cannot be proved from any exemption he hath from being judged, let us proceed to consider the next proof taken

¹ "Ad omnes auctoritates quæ contra præfatam assertionem sonare videntur, unicam dant responsionem generalem, dicentes quod intelligi debeat, quando papa non est diffamatus de hæresi, nec in aliquo crimine, de quo scandalizaretur ecclesia, incorrigibilis notorie reperitur."—Ockam. Dialog. Part. i. Lib. vi. cap. 62. [Apud Goldast. Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp. Tom. ii. p. 567, Francof. 1614.]

² "Papa per synodum, in criminibus etiam aliis quam hæresi, judicari potest."—Nicol. de Cusa, Concord. Cathol. Lib. ii. cap. 17. [p. 737.]

³ "Papa dum labitur in hæresim jam damnatam, est eo facto per Deum depositus, et perdidit jure divino papalem dignitatem; sive hoc hæresis sit secreta, ut ampliant aliqui, sive sit manifesta, ut placet aliis loqui restrictius."—Gerson. De Auferibilitate Papæ, Consid. 16. [Tom. ii. col. 219.]

⁴ "Pono hanc propositionem. Summus pontifex non solum deponi potest ab ecclesia seu concilio pro hæresi, verum etiam et pro alio crimine notorio ecclesiam scandalizante."—Almain. [De Authorit. Eccles. et Concil. General. cap. 12. Inter Opp. Gerson. Tom. ii. col. 1008.]

⁵ "Cum ergo papa sit frater et membrum in corpore Christi, consequens videtur, quod ipse aut a fide devians, aut scandalose vivens subjectus sit judicio ecclesiæ."—Driedo, De Dogmat. extra can. Script. sacr. constit. Lib. iv. cap. 4. [Fol. 240, B. Tom. i. Lovan. 1556.]

from the names and titles given to him, which is more weak than any other. For we shall find that other bishops in ancient times, writing to the Roman bishop, sometimes call him brother, sometimes fellow-bishop and colleague, sometimes bishop, sometimes archbishop, sometimes patriarch; but that they never gave him any title whence he may be proved to have an universality of illimited jurisdiction over all.

The first title that our adversaries¹ urge is that of Pope, which (as I think) will hardly prove the Roman bishop to have power over all. For whereas *papa* or *papas* among the Greeks signifieth a father, and is the appellation that little children beginning to speak are wont to give to their parents, and in like sort among the Latins noteth a father or grandfather, hence the Christians in ancient times did use to call their spiritual fathers and bishops papes or popes: so that the name of pape or pope was a common name to all bishops. Whereupon Hierome² writing to Augustine, calleth him pope, and writeth, "To the most honourable pope;" whereas yet he was not universal bishop, but bishop of little Hippo only; and therefore the name of pope doth no way prove every one that is so called to be universal bishop. But they say, the bishop of Rome is named absolutely pope, and none other bishop, and that whensoever the name of pope was used absolutely without addition, all men understood thereby the Roman bishop to be meant. Whence it may be inferred, that he was greater than all the rest, as being esteemed a common father of all. But for answer hereunto we say, that the Roman bishop was never in ancient times named absolutely the pape or pope, without specification of his name, or the place whereof he was pope, but when by some other circumstance it might be known, what pape or pope it was men speak of, accordingly as men are wont to say no more, but, the bishop did this or that, when by things going before it may be known what bishop they

¹ "Argumentum postremum sumitur ex nominibus episcopi Romani quæ sunt quindecim, Papa, Pater Patrum, Christianorum Pontifex, Summus Sacerdos, Princeps Sacerdotum, Vicarius Christi, Caput totius ecclesiæ, Fundamentum ædificii ecclesiæ, Pastor ovilis Domini, Pater et Doctor omnium fidelium, Rector domus Dei, Custos vineæ Dei, Sponsus ecclesiæ, Apostolicæ sedis præsul, Episcopus universalis. Ex quibus omnibus et singulis aperte colligitur ejus primatus."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. II. cap. 31. [p. 345.]

² Hier. in Omnib. Epist. ad Augustinum.

mean; and so the vicars of Leo in the council of Chalcedon¹ said, The most blessed and apostolic man the pope gave them such directions as they there specify; without adding of Rome, or the name of Leo, because all men knew from what pope they came, and whose vicegerents they were in that council. For otherwise without some circumstances specifying the party, men would never have understood whom they had meant, if they had only named the pope indefinitely. But the same vicars of Leo in the council of Chalcedon call him pope of the universal Church: "Therefore," saith Bellarmine², "we may conclude him to be supreme and absolute commander over all, out of the titles given unto him." If the cardinal would but remember that every bishop is interested in the care and government of the whole Church (as I have elsewhere showed out of Cyprian³), he would easily find the weakness of this consequence.

Wherefore let us pass from the title of Pope to the next, which is *Pater patrum*, that is, "Father of fathers," which Bellarmine saith is given to the Roman bishop, and to none else; whereas yet he knoweth the contrary to be most true. For the relation made to John the patriarch of Constantinople, by the whole synod assembled, beginneth in this sort⁴: *Domino nostro sanctissimo, et beatissimo patri patrum, et œcumenico patriarchæ, synodus, &c.* Where we see that the patriarch of Constantinople is called by a whole synod Most holy Lord, Most blessed Father of fathers, and Œcumenical Patriarch. And the epistle of the bishops of the second Syria to the same John the patriarch beginneth thus⁵: "To our

¹ "Βονιφάκιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος πρεσβύτερος εἶπεν· Ὁ μακαριώτατος καὶ ἀποστολικὸς ἐπίσκοπος μετὰ πολλὰ καὶ τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἐνετείλατο."—In Concil. Chalced. Act. xvi. [Labbe, Tom. iv. col. 1748.]

² Ubi supra.

³ Cypr. Lib. iii. Epist. xiii. [Vid. Chap. xxxvii. p. 347, supra.]

⁴ "Τῷ δεσπότῃ ἡμῶν τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ πατρὶ πατέρων ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ οἰκουμένικῳ πατριάρχῃ Ἰωάννῃ."—Relat. Concil. Constant. sub Menna, ad Joann. Antioch. Act. v. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 1132.]

⁵ "Τῷ δεσπότῃ ἡμῶν τῷ πάντα ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ πατρὶ πατέρων ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ οἰκουμένικῳ πατριάρχῃ Ἰωάννῃ."—Epist. Episc. Secundæ Syriæ ad Joann. Antioch. [Ibid. col. 1184.]

"Τῷ ὀσιωτάτῳ καὶ ἀγιωτάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ οἰκουμένικῳ πατριάρχῃ Ἰωάννῃ, καὶ τῇ ἐνδημούσῃ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ, κ.τ.λ."—Supplicat. Clericor. et Monachor. Antioch. ad Joann. Antioch. [Ibid. col. 1128.]

most holy Lord, and to the most blessed Father of fathers, œcumenical archbishop and patriarch." So that the title of Father of fathers is not proper to the Roman bishop, as Bellarmine untruly affirmeth. The title of *Summus Sacerdos*, or high-priest, given to him by St Hierome¹ is common to all bishops, in respect of presbyters, and all metropolitans, in respect of bishops; (although the third council of Carthage², to show that metropolitans have not an absolute command, will not have them called high priests, or chief priests, but only bishops of the first see); and therefore though the pope should be named most holy father, chiefest pope, chief of priests, or high priest, yet nothing could be concluded from hence, that either we deny, or they affirm.

The title of Vicar of Christ is new, and not found in all antiquity, the first in whom we read it being Bernard³; and therefore not much to be stood on, seeing the ancient make all bishops the vicars of Christ, and do never appropriate it unto the bishop of Rome. Yet will not Bernard's appropriating of it prove the thing in question, seeing he may be thought to have had an eye in so doing to the chieftly of order and honour, (in respect whereof he is in more special sort a vicar of Christ than some other), rather than to any universality of commission and authority. Head of the Church, the pope is never called among the ancient, though the cardinal be pleased untruly so to report. But the bishops assembled in the council of Chalcedon⁴ writing to Leo, who by vicars was president of that assembly, say, he was over them, as the head over the members, not in respect of absolute commanding authority, but of honourable presidency only, as it appeareth in that (notwithstanding the resistance of his vicegerents) they passed a decree

¹ Hieron. Præfat. in Evang. ad Damasum. [Tom. x. col. 661.]

² "Ut primæ sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi, sed tantum primæ sedis episcopus."—Concil. Carthag. III. Can. 26. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 1403.]

³ "De cætero oportere te esse considera formam justitiæ, . . . sal terræ, orbis lumen, sacerdotem altissimi, vicarium Christi, christum Domini, postremum Deum Pharaonis."—Bernard. De Considerat. [Ad Eugenium Papam.] Lib. II. [Leg. IV. cap. 7. Tom. I. col. 450. Par. 1719.]

⁴ "Ὡς σὺ μὲν ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν ἡγεμόνευες ἐν τοῖς τῇν τάξιν ἐπέχουσι, τὴν εὐνοίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος, κ.τ.λ."—Concil. Chalced. [Part. III. cap. 2. Labbe, Tom. IV. col. 1776.]

for the advancement of the bishop of Constantinople. For otherwise St Gregory bishop of Rome alloweth no man to be called head of the Church. *Petrus*¹ (saith he) *primum membrum sanctæ et universalis Ecclesiæ est: Paulus, Andreas, Jacobus, quid aliud quam singularum plebium sunt capita? omnes tamen sub uno capite membra Ecclesiæ sunt*: that is, "Peter is the first and in honour the chiefest member of the holy and universal Church: Paul, Andrew, James, what other thing are they than heads of several parts of God's people? Yet so that all, notwithstanding, are members of the Church under one head." So that a head of the Church besides Christ must not be acknowledged, because no one hath an universal commanding power over all, but he only. Yet in a certain sense the Roman Church is named the head of all Churches; that is, the first and chiefest of all Churches, as the city of London may be named the head of all cities in this state and kingdom, though it hath not a commanding authority over them, neither is the chief magistrate thereof head over all other magistrates in the kingdom. The authority of the Florentine council², naming the bishop of Rome, "Father and Teacher of all Christians," and the council of Lyons³ naming him "the Bridegroom of the Church," is not so great, that we should need much to insist upon anything that is alleged out of them. And touching the latter title, we know St Bernard⁴, in his epistles, wisheth the pope not to take it on him, as being proper to Christ, but to think it honour enough to be a friend of the bridegroom. And yet if we should yield it unto him,

¹ Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxiv. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xviii. Tom. ii. col. 743.]

² "Item diffinimus sanctam apostolicam sedem et Romanum pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum; et ipsum pontificem Romanum...totius ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem et doctorem existere."—Concil. Florent. Sess. Ult. [Labbe, Tom. xviii. col. 526.]

³ "Per necessaria totius mundi provisio idoneo celeriter eidem ecclesiæ sponso dato."—Conc. Lugd. Cap. 'Ubi periculum.' De Electione. In 6. [Scil. Lib. Sext. Decretal. Tit. de Electione, cap. 3. col. 80. Lugd. 1624.]

⁴ "Si amicus sponsi es, ne dixeris dilectam ejus principem meam, sed principem, nil tuum in ea vindicans nisi quod pro ea, si oportuerit, etiam animam dare debes."—Bernard. Epist. cxxxviii. [Tom. i. col. 234.]

we know what Gerson¹ hath written, to show how this bridegroom may be taken away from the Church the spouse of Christ, and yet the Church remain entire and perfect.

The next glorious title of the Roman bishop, is "Bishop of an apostolic see." But this is common to him with many others, as some of the rest also are: for, as not only the Roman Church, but the Churches of Ephesus, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, which the apostles founded, and in which they sat as bishops, are named apostolical Churches, so the bishops of all these are named bishops of apostolic sees. Neither do men know which of the apostolic Churches is expressed by the name of the apostolic see, or which of the bishops by the name of the bishop of the apostolic see, unless by some circumstance the same be specified. As when Augustine said² there were relations made from the council of Carthage and Milevis to the apostolic see, all men understood what apostolic see he meant, because it was known to what apostolic Church they used to make such relations. Neither doth the principality of the apostolic chair, which Augustine³ affirmeth to have ever flourished in Rome, argue the supremacy of the pope, seeing the principality or chieftly of the apostolic chair, mentioned by St Augustine, may seem to import the chieftly that the apostolic chair hath above those that are not apostolic, or in which blessed Peter, the chief of the apostles, did not sit. For though the chairs of the apostles were in divers places, yet Peter's chair was esteemed the principal of all the rest, which being the see and chair of one, yet was in three places, and three bishops did sit in it; namely, the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, as I have showed before⁴ out of Gregory: yet was the principality, or chieftly of this chair of Peter, more specially in Rome than in the other places, and the bishop of Rome in order and honour the first and greatest of the three.

The last title brought to prove the supremacy of the pope,

¹ Gerson, De Auferibilitate Papæ.

² "Missæ sunt de hac re ex duobus conciliis, Carthaginensi et Milevitano, relationes ad apostolicam sedem."—August. Epist. cvi. [Al. clxxxvi. Tom. ii. col. 664.]

³ "Romana ecclesia, in qua semper apostolicæ cathedræ viguit principatus."—Id. Epist. clxii. [Al. xliii. col. 91.]

⁴ Chap. xxxi. [p. 258. supra.]

is that of "Universal Bishop," which though it be not given to Leo bishop of Rome by the whole council of Chalcedon, yet is it given to him in the epistles of three several Grecians writing to him, as we may read in the third action of that council¹: and Saint Gregory² saith it was offered to his predecessors in that council, and that they refused it. This title will prove the supremacy of the pope no better than the rest, being common unto other with him, and therefore no way arguing any thing peculiarly found in him alone. For we shall find that the bishops of Constantinople are named universal bishops, and œcumenical patriarchs³, as well as the bishop of Rome, and that not by one or two particular men, but by whole councils, by emperors, and popes: and though Saint Gregory justly disliked this name or title, as profane and prejudicial to the dignity of all other bishops and patriarchs, when it importeth an universality of jurisdiction, and general commanding authority over all, yet might any one of the patriarchs be named an universal bishop, as being one of those five principal bishops to whom all the bishops and metropolitans in the world were subject.

¹ Concil. Constant. Act. III. [Scil. Epist. Theodori, Ischyronis, Athanasii, ad Leonem. Labbe, Tom. IV. coll. 1267, 1282.]

² "Certe pro beati Petri apostolorum principis honore per venerandam Chalcedonensem synodum Romano pontificii oblatum est. Sed nullus eorum unquam hoc singularitatis nomine uti consensit, ne dum privatum aliquid daretur uni, honore debito sacerdotes privarentur universi."—Greg. Lib. IV. Epist. xxxii. [Al. Lib. V. Epist. xx. Tom. II. col. 749.]

³ "Καθὼς περιέχουσι τὰ γράμματα τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου Ἀδριανοῦ πάπα τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, καὶ τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου, οὕτως φρονῶ."—Concil. [Nicæn. II.] General. VII. Act. II. Epist. Hadrian. ad Tharas. [Labbe, Tom. VIII. col. 777.]

"Τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ Κυρίῳ καὶ δεσπότῃ Ταρασίῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ, οἱ τῆς ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεῖς ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρουσιν."—Epist. Præsul. Oriental. Ad eundem Tharas. Ibid. Act. III. [col. 818.]

CHAPTER XLII.

OF THE SECOND SUPPOSED PRIVILEGE OF THE ROMAN BISHOPS,
WHICH IS INFALLIBILITY OF JUDGMENT.

SEEING our adversaries cannot prove the universal and illimited power and jurisdiction of their popes, but the contrary is most clearly deposed by those witnesses which they produce to speak for them, affirmed by those divines whom they cannot but acknowledge to be catholic, and inferred out of their own principles; let us proceed to see whether they have any better proofs of the infallibility of their judgment; which is the next supposed privilege of the Roman bishops. Touching this point I find four opinions in the Church of Rome¹. The first is, that the pope is so led into all truth, that he cannot err in such sort as to become an heretic: and of this opinion was Albertus Pighius². The second leaveth it doubtful whether he may be an heretic or not, but pronounceth confidently that whether he may or not, yet he cannot define and decree any thing that is heretical: and this is the opinion

¹ "Quatuor remanent diversæ sententiæ. Prima est, pontificem etiam ut pontificem, etiamsi cum generali concilio definiret aliquid, posse esse hæreticum in se et docere alios hæresim, et de facto aliquando ita accidisse. Hæc est hæreticorum omnium hujus temporis.

"Secunda sententia est, pontificem etiam ut pontificem posse esse hæreticum, et docere hæresim, si absque generali concilio definiat, et de facto aliquando accidisse. Hanc opinionem sequitur et tuetur Nilus in suo libro adversus primatum papæ; et eandem secuti sunt aliquot Parisienses, ut Gerson et Almain. in lib. de Potest. Eccles. necnon Alphonsus de Castro lib. i. cap. 2. contr. Hæreses, et Hadrianus papa VI. in quæst. de confirm. quî omnes non in pontifice, sed in ecclesia, sive in concilio generali tantum constituunt infallibilitatem judicii de rebus fidei.

"Tertia sententia est in altero extremo, pontificem non posse ullo modo esse hæreticum, nec docere publice hæresim, etiamsi solus rem aliquam definiat."—Ita Albertus Pighius, Lib. iv. Hier. Eccles. cap. 8.

"Quarta sententia est quodammodo in medio, pontificem sive hæreticus esse possit, sive non, non posse ullo modo definire aliquid hæreticum a tota ecclesia credendum; hæc est communissima opinio omnium fere catholicorum."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 2. [p. 393.]

² "Esse omnino non potest, ut sit papa hæreticus."—Albert. Pigh. Hierarch. Eccles. Lib. iv. cap. 8. [p. 244. col. Agripp. 1572.]

of almost all papists at this day¹. The third, that the pope not only as a particular doctor, but even as pope, may be an heretic, and teach heresy, if he define without a general council. This was the opinion of Gerson, Almain, and other Parisians; of Alphonsus a Castro, pope Adrian the Sixth, cardinal Cameracensis, Cusanus, Occam, Durandus, the fathers of the councils of Constance and Basil, and many more. The fourth, that he may err and define for heresy, though he be assisted with a general council. Of this opinion was Waldensis², and sundry other, as appeareth by Picus Mirandula in his Theorems³. So that it is not true that Bellarmine saith, that all catholics consent that the pope with a general council cannot err. For these teach that only the resolutions of the universal Church (which is the multitude of believers that are and have been) are to be received without any farther question or examination, as undoubtedly true. These are the differences of opinions found among them that brag so much of unity, and make the ground thereof to be the submitting of their judgments to the pope. But because in so great uncertainty and

¹ "Media et vera sententia est, Romanum pontificem, ut privata persona est, tam in fide esse defectibilem, quam in moribus peccabilem; sed ut publica persona est, id est, quando de fide consultus ex officio respondet et decernit, hæreticum dogma nec hactenus tradidisse, nec tradere posse. Hæc media veritas est nunc apud catholicos certa et recepta, etsi non de fide. Et contrarium sustinere, esset assertio erronea, scandalosa, et offensiva, etsi fortasse non hæretica. Est nunc recepta et communis, quia non solum veteres scholastici doctores, ut S. Thomas, Thom. Waldensis, Joann. De Turrecremata, sed et moderni scriptores, ut Pighius, Roffensis contra Lutherum, Melchior Canus, et Cajetan, illam sustinent et docent."—Stapleton, Relect. Controv. III. Quæst. 4. [Tom. I. p. 712. Par. 1620.]

² "Non est ergo specialis ecclesia, non Africana, ut Donatus dixit. Non utique particularis illa Romana; sed universalis ecclesia, non quidem in generali synodo congregata, quam aliquotiens errasse percepimus, sed est ecclesia Christi catholica per totum mundum dispersa."—Waldens. Doctrinal. Fid. Lib. II. Art. 2. cap. 19. [Tom. I. p. 193. Ven. 1571.]

³ "Theologorum multi etiam juris interpretum plerique voluere concilium ipsum si una cum pontifice maximo in eis controversiis, quæ aut ad essentiam fidei, aut ad necessarios bene Christianeque vivendum mores pertinent sententiam ferat, nullo pacto errare posse.... Restiterunt alii affirmantes errare posse concilia et jam errasse."—Pic. Mirand. Theorem. IV. Tom. II. p. 176. Bas. 1601.]

contrariety of judgments, almost all papists at this day incline to that opinion, that the pope, whether he may err personally or not, yet cannot define for falsehood, and err; let us first see how they endeavour to confirm the same: and secondly, how they can clear those popes from heresy, and decreeing for heresy, that are charged therewith.

To prove that the pope cannot decree for heresy¹, they allege in the first place the saying of Christ, who professeth that he prayed for Peter that his faith should not fail²; and lest we should misunderstand the words of Christ, they bring us the interpretations of Augustin³, Chrysostom⁴, and Theophylact⁵: whereof the first saith, "That when Christ prayed that Peter's faith might not fail, he prayed that he might have a most free, courageous, invincible and resolute will, to continue in the true faith." The second, that Christ did not say to Peter, "Thou shalt not deny me; but, I have prayed that thy faith shall not fail. For by his care and favour it was brought to pass, that Peter's faith should not fail, though for fear he denied his master." The third bringeth in Christ speaking to Peter in this sort: "Although for a little time thou shalt be shaken, thou hast notwithstanding the seeds of faith hid in thee; although the wind and violent blast of him that setteth on thee shall shake off the leaves, yet the root shall live, and thy faith shall not fail." So that all these so understand the prayer of Christ for Peter, as that he should not only rise again after his fall, and be found faithful in the end, but that he should never fall in respect of the persuasion of faith that was to rest immoveably in him, even in that most dangerous time of the temptation and trial of the apostles,

¹ Bellarm. De Pontif. Lib. II. cap. 3.

² Luke xxii. 32.

³ "Quando rogavit ergo ne fides ejus deficeret, quid aliud rogavit, nisi ut haberet in fide liberrimam, fortissimam, invictissimam, perseverantissimam voluntatem."—August. De Corrept. et Grat. cap. 8. [Tom. x. col. 759.]

⁴ "Οὐκ εἶπεν ἵνα μὴ ἀρνήσῃ, ἀλλ' ὥστε μὴ ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὥστε μὴ τέλεον ἀπολεσθαι. Τῆς γὰρ αὐτοῦ κηδεμονίας τοῦτο γέγονε, καὶ γὰρ ὁ φόβος πάντα ἐξέβαλεν, ἄμετρος γὰρ ἦν."—Chrysost. In Matt. Hom. LXXXIII. [Al. LXXXII. Tom. VII. p. 786.]

⁵ "Εἰ γὰρ καὶ πρὸς μικρὸν μέλλεις σαλευθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἔχεις ἐναποκείμενα τὰ σπέρματα τῆς πίστεως· κἂν τὰ φύλλα ἔρριψε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐπηρεάζοντος, ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα ζῇ, καὶ οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἡ πίστις σου."—Theophylact. In Luc. xxii. [p. 517. Par. 1631.]

when Christ was delivered into the hands of wicked men to be crucified. For howsoever he denied Christ with bitter imprecations, yet he did it out of fear, and not out of infidelity; the persuasion of his heart remaining the same that it was before. Wherefore having the words of Christ, and the meaning of them, let us see whether the opinion which our adversaries have of the pope's infallible discerning and constant defending of the truth may be confirmed out of them. If they could prove the contrary to that which was found in Peter to be found in the pope, by virtue of Christ's prayer for Peter, they might easily make good their opinion. But otherwise never out of these words. For thus they must reason, if they will confirm the conceit they have of the infallibility of the pope's judgment, by Christ's prayer for Peter: Peter's faith by virtue of Christ's prayer for him remained firm, immoveable, and most constantly settled in inward persuasion and affection, though it failed for a little time in outward profession: therefore howsoever the faith of the pope may fail in respect of the persuasion of his heart, yet it shall never fail in respect of outward profession: for though he become an heretic in heart, yet he shall ever profess rightly concerning Christ to all men that shall come unto him to enquire of him and to be resolved by him. This kind of reasoning, I think, is not very forcible, and therefore it is much to be doubted that the Romanists will never be able to persuade men that the pope cannot err, by virtue of Christ's prayer for Peter: nay, that no such thing can be proved out of Christ's words unto Peter it is most plain and evident, because the words that Christ spake unto Peter, when he said unto him, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren¹," are no way applicable to Peter's successors. For that if they were, first, they must ever be right believers in heart, notwithstanding whatsoever failings in outward confession; secondly, they must deny Christ as he did, and afterwards repent of such denial, and convert and turn unto God, that so they may confirm their brethren. For so it was in Peter. And Theophylact² doth not attribute the confir-

¹ Luke xxii. 32.

² "Σὺ γὰρ, ὦ Πέτρε, ἐπιστρέψας καλὸν ὑπόδειγμα γενήσῃ πᾶσιν εἰς μετάνοιαν, καὶ οὐδεὶς τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμὲ ἀπογνώσεται ἀποβλέπων πρὸς σε τὸν ἀπόστολον μὲν ὄντα ἀρνησάμενον δέ, καὶ πάλιν τὰ πρωτεῖα πάντων,

mation of the brethren by Peter, which he is commanded to perform, to his constancy in the true faith, and in the profession of it, but to the experience that he had of the tender mercy and goodness of God towards him; out of which he was able to strengthen them that were weak, to comfort them that were sorrowful, to put them in assured hope of finding mercy that otherwise might despair, and to confirm them that were doubtful. For who will not (as the same Theophylact fitly observeth) be confirmed by Peter in the right persuasion of the mercies and goodness of God towards repentant sinners, when he seeth him whom Christ had so much honoured, after so shameful a fault, and so execrable a fact of the abnegation of his Lord and Master, the Lord of life, not only received to mercy, but restored to the dignity of the prime and chief apostle? To this objection (as we think) unanswerable, Bellarmine answereth¹, first, that it is not absurd to refer the conversion of Peter mentioned by Christ, after which he is to confirm his brethren, not to his turning from sin, but to his brethren, to advise, admonish, and direct them; not making the sense to be, “Thou being turned from sin by repentance, confirm thy brethren,” but, “Thou whose faith shall never fail, when thou seest any of thy brethren wavering, turn thyself unto them and confirm them.” Secondly, that it followeth not that the successors of Peter must first fall, and after repent of their fall, if the words of Christ be applied unto them of confirming the brethren;

καὶ τὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπιστάσιαν λαβόντα διὰ τῆς μετανοίας.—Id. [p. 517.]

¹ “Dico prius, non esse absurdum, si dicamus illud ‘Conversus’ non referri ad pœnitentiam Petri, sed ad tentationes aliorum, ut non sit sensus, ‘Tu a peccato ad pœnitentiam conversus confirma fratres,’ sed, ‘Tu cujus fides non potest deficere, quando videris aliquos nutantes et vacillantes, ad eos conversus illos confirma.’ Nam nondum prædixerat Petro casum suum, sed paulo post prædicturus erat: videtur autem absurdum, si prius prædicatur conversio quam aversio, resurrectio quam casus.

“Dico secundo, si exponamus, conversus a negatione, non necessario convenire successoribus Petri converti a peccato negandi; cum necessario tamen conveniat eis confirmare fratres. Nam converti a peccato non convenit hominibus, nisi quatenus privatæ personæ sint, et ideo personale donum est: at confirmare fratres convenit homini ut caput est et princeps aliorum, et ideo transit ad successores.”—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 3. [p. 395.]

seeing Peter's fall was personal, but his confirming his brethren is of office, wherein they are to succeed him, and not in the things that are personal. This answer of the cardinal is insufficient. First, because the current of almost all interpreters understandeth the conversion of Peter mentioned by our Saviour of his turning from sin, and not of his turning of himself to them whom he was to advise, comfort, and confirm. And, secondly, because in this his answer he contrarieth himself. For elsewhere¹ (which it seemeth in making this answer he had forgotten) he denieth that the words of Christ directed to Peter, of confirming his brethren, may be understood of the universal Church, or the bishops of it, and saith: *Hoc certe non potest Ecclesiæ toti convenire, nisi dicamus totam Ecclesiam aliquando esse pervertendam, ut postea iterum convertatur*: that is, "This saying of Christ cannot agree to the whole Church, unless we say the whole Church shall at some time be perverted, that afterwards it may be converted." Whereby it is clear he thinketh that the latter part of Christ's speech, of confirming the brethren, can agree to none to whom the former doth not. So that we see the words of Christ spoken to Peter are no sufficient warrant unto us that the pope cannot err; and therefore the better to persuade us of the same, our adversaries bring the sayings of some great divines, who conceived that some such thing may be inferred out of the words as they dream of, as Lucius², Felix³, and Mark⁴, ancient bishops of Rome, and great lights of the world

¹ Eodem cap. [p. 394.]

² "Hæc sancta et apostolica mater omnium ecclesiarum Christi ecclesia quæ a tramite apostolicæ traditionis nunquam errasse probatur, nec hæreticis novitatibus depravata succubuit,....secundum ipsius Domini pollicitationem, dicentis; 'Ego rogavi pro te,' &c."—Lucius I. In epist. ad Episc. Hisp. et Galliæ. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 744.]

³ "Ut in exordio normam fidei Christianæ percepit ab auctoribus suis, apostolorum Christi principibus, illibata fine tenus manet, secundum ipsius Domini salvatoris divinam pollicitationem, qui suorum discipulorum principi in suis fatus est evangeliiis, Petre,' &c."—Felix I. Epist. ad Benignum. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 928.]

⁴ Marc. Epist. ad Athanas. de missione can. Nicæn. Conc. [Ubi eadem verba recitantur. Sed vide Binium in not. "Hanc epistolam surreptitiam, et ab aliquo confictam fuisse quinque rationibus evidenter ostenditur."—Labbe, Tom. ii. col. 492.]

in their times. If they could indeed bring us the judgment and resolution of these ancient bishops, they would doubtless greatly prevail with us. But seeing under these names they bring forth unto us the authors of shameless forgeries, we are thereby induced more to dislike their conceits than before. Now that they (who, masked under the names and titles of ancient Roman bishops, magnify the greatness of the Roman Church, and plead for the not erring of the bishops thereof) are nothing else but ignorant authors of absurd and shameless forgeries, it will easily appear out of that which I have elsewhere¹ largely discoursed, to show that the epistles attributed to the ancient popes are forged and counterfeit; not only by the judgments and opinions of the best learned on both sides so censuring them, but by many reasons inducing us so to think: among which one is, the likeness of the style found in these epistles, arguing that they came all out of the same mint, and were not written by those different popes living at divers times, to whom they are attributed. Which similitude of style will be found in these epistles that our adversaries allege to prove that the pope cannot err, as much or more than in any other: for in these we shall find the very same words. The agreeing of witnesses in the same substance of matter with some difference of words, argueth that they speak truly; but their precise agreement in words and forms of speaking argueth rather a compact and agreement to speak the same things, than a desire to utter the truth. So here, the precise using of the very same words by all these popes living at divers times, argueth that it was one man that taught them all to speak. But they will say, pope Leo, in his third sermon of his assumption to the popedom, saith as much as they do, and that therefore we may not discredit their testimony. Surely if they can prove that Leo saith any such thing as the former popes are taught to say, we will most willingly listen unto them. For we acknowledge Leo to have been a most worthy bishop, and the things that go under his name to be his indubitate works. Let us hear therefore what he saith. His words in the place cited by the cardinal are these²: “Christ took special care of

¹ Chap. xxxiv. [p. 279.]

² “Specialis a Domino Petri cura suscipitur, et pro fide Petri proprie supplicatur, tanquam aliorum status certior sit futurus, si

Peter, and prayed specially for him, because the state of the rest is more secure, when the mind of him that is chief is not overcome. In Peter therefore the strength of all is surely established, and God doth so dispense the help of his divine grace, that the same firmness that he giveth to Peter is by Peter conferred and bestowed on all." Here is nothing to prove that the pope cannot err, which is that our adversaries undertake to demonstrate, nor that the Roman Church cannot err, which is that the former popes affirm in their counterfeit epistles: but that the state of the rest is more secure, when he that is chief is not overcome; which no man ever doubted of: and that Christ gave, or at least promised to give, that assistance of his grace to Peter, which he meant to the rest, and to pass it by him unto them, so as they should receive it after him, but not from him. For thus the words of Leo must be understood, seeing it is most certain (which thing also Bellarmine¹ himself confesseth) that the apostles received their infallibility of judgment, and their commission or authority, immediately from Christ, and not from Peter. From Leo they pass to Agatho, who in his epistle to Constantine the emperor, read and approved in the sixth general council²,

mens principis victa non fuerit. In Petro ergo omnium fortitudo munitur, et divinæ gratiæ ita ordinatur auxilium, ut firmitas quæ per Christum Petro tribuitur, per Petrum apostolis conferatur."—Leo, Serm. III. [Al. IV.] In Annivers. Assumpt. [Tom. I. col. 18. Ven. 1753.]

¹ "Dicuntur fundamenta omnes apostoli ratione gubernationis. Omnes enim fuerunt capita, rectores, et pastores ecclesiæ universæ, sed non eodem modo quo Petrus: illi enim habuerunt summam atque amplissimam potestatem ut apostoli seu legati, Petrus autem ut pastor ordinarius: deinde ita habuerunt plenitudinem potestatis, ut tamen Petrus esset caput eorum, et ab illo penderent, non e contrario."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. I. cap. 11. [p. 271.]

² "Apostolica Christi ecclesia per Dei omnipotentis gratiam a tramite apostolicæ traditionis nunquam errasse probabitur, nec hæreticis novitatibus depravata succubuit, sed ut ab exordio fidei Christianæ percepit ab auctoribus suis apostolorum Christi principibus, illibata fine tenus permanet, secundum ipsius domini salvatoris divinam pollicitationem, quam suorum discipulorum principi in sacris evangeliiis fatus est. Consideret itaque vestra tranquilla clementia, quoniam Dominus et salvator omnium cujus fides est qui fidem Petri non defecturam promisit confirmare eum fratres suos admonuit, quod apostolicos pontifices, meæ exiguitatis prædecessores confidenter fecisse

saith, "that by the grace of God such hath been the felicity and happiness of the Roman Church, that it can never be proved to have erred from the path of the apostolical tradition, nor to have fallen being depraved with heretical novelties; but the same faith it received at first it holdeth still, according to Christ's promise which he made to Peter, willing him to confirm his brethren. Which thing," saith Agatho, "my predecessors have ever done, as is well known to all." These words of Agatho are not so far to be urged, as if simply never any of his predecessors had failed to defend the truth, and confirm his brethren, but that the Roman Church was ever so preserved from heresy, that however some few in it for a time might neglect to do their duty, yet neither so long, nor in such sort, but that that Church and the bishops of it were always a stay to the rest in all the dangerous trials that fell out in ancient times; even as in the question concerning the two wills of Christ, about which the council was called, it was; wherein though Honorius failed, yet the rest that governed the apostolical throne with him did not; and Agatho, who soon after succeeded, showed himself an orthodox and right believer. For that all the predecessors of Agatho did not always confirm their brethren in the true faith of Christ, it is most evident, in that Marcellinus sacrificed unto idols, (if we may believe the Romish stories¹), and was forced, being convicted thereof, to profess himself unworthy of the papal office and dignity in a synod of bishops; in that Liberius² and Felix communicated with heretics, and *semper, cunctis est cognitum.*"—[Concil. Const. III. General. VI.] Act. IV. [Labbe, Tom. VII. col. 662.]

¹ "Marcellinus pontifex ad sacrificia gentium ductus, cum minis instarent carnifices ut thura diis exhiberet, metu perterritus Deos alienos adoravit."—Platina in Marcellino. [p. 39. Colon. Ubior. 1600.]

Vid. etiam Acta Concilii Sinuessani. [Labbe, Tom. I. col. 957, sqq.]

² "Ὁ Λιβέριος ἐξορισθεὶς ὕστερον μετὰ διετὴ χρόνον ὤκλασε, καὶ φοβηθεὶς τὸν ἀπειλούμενον θάνατον ὑπέγραψεν."—Athanas. [Hist. Arian.] Ad Solitar. vitam agentes. [Tom. I. p. 368.]

"Cum Felix ab Arianis fuisset in sacerdotium substitutus plurimi pejeraverunt, et post annum cum Felice ejecti sunt, quia Liberius tædio victus exilii, et in hæreticam pravitatem subscribens, Romam quasi victor intraverat."—Hieron. In Chronico. [Tom. VIII. col. 796.]

"Fortunatianus Aquileiensis episcopus, ... in hoc habetur detestabilis, quod Liberium, urbis Romanæ episcopum pro fide ad exilium

subscribed to the unjust condemnation of worthy Athanasius; which was not to confirm the brethren, but to discourage, dishearten, and weaken them; and in that Agatho himself¹ doth anathematize his predecessor Honorius as a Monothelite; with whom Leo the Second² concurreth in his epistle to Constantine the emperor, who anathematizing Theodorus, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, and other Monothelites, addeth to them Honorius, bishop of Rome, his predecessor; saying, "We accurse also Honorius, who did not lighten this apostolical Church with the doctrine delivered by the apostles, but sought to subvert the undefiled faith by profane perfidiousness." With whom also pope Adrian agreeth, who in the synod of Rome called about the business of Photius of Constantinople, saith³ that "the Roman bishop hath judged of the bishops of

pergentem primus sollicitavit ac fregit, et ad subscriptionem hæreseos compulit."—Id. Catal. Script. Eccles. [Siv. De Vir. Illustr. cap. 97.]

"Acacius....in tantum sub Constantio imperatore claruit, ut in Liberii locum Romæ Felicem [Arianum, *editt. quædam*,] episcopum constitueret."—Ibid. [cap. 98. Tom. II. col. 917.]

"Liberius ingressus in urbem Romam quarto nonas Augusti consensit Constantio hæretico; non tamen rebaptizatus est, sed consensum præbuit."—Damas. Lib. Pontif. In Vit. Liberii. [Labbe, Tom. II. col. 795.]

¹ "Ὅποταν δὲ δύο φύσεις καὶ δύο φυσικὰ θελήματα, καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ὁμολογοῦμεν ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, οὐκ ἐναντία ταῦτα, οὔτε ἀλλήλοις ἀντικείμενα λέγομεν, καθὼς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας πλανωμένοι τῆς ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως κατηγοροῦσιν, κ.τ.λ."—Epist. Agathon. ad Constantinum, quæ habetur Synod VI. Act. 4. [Labbe, Tom. VII. col. 660.]

² "Anathematizamus novi erroris inventores, id est, Theodorum Pharanitanum episcopum, Cyrum Alexandrinum, Sergium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, Petrum, Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ successores magis quam præsules, nec non et Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est."—Epist. Leonis ad Constant. in fine concil. ejusdem. [col. 1156.]

³ "Siquidem Romanum pontificem de omnium ecclesiarum præsulibus judicasse legimus, de eo vero quenquam judicasse non legimus. Licet enim Honorio ab orientalibus post mortem anathema sit dictum, sciendum tamen est quia fuerat super hæresi accusatus, propter quam solam licitum est minoribus majorum suorum motibus resistendi, vel pravos sensus libere respuendi; quamvis et ibi nec patriarcharum nec cæterorum antistitum cuipiam de eo quemlibet fas fuerit proferendi sententiam, nisi ejusdem primæ sedis pontificis consensus præcessisset

all Churches, but that we read not of any one that hath judged him. For though Honorius were accursed after his death by those of the East, yet it was because he was accused of heresy, in which only case the lesser may judge the greater; yet even there it had not been lawful for any of them to give sentence against him, had not the consent of the first see gone before." So that we see the epistle of Agatho doth not sufficiently prove that the popes cannot err. Let us therefore consider whether they have any better proofs. "Nicholas the First," saith Bellarmine, "in his epistle to Michael the emperor¹, pronounceth that the privileges of the see of Rome are perpetual, rooted and planted by Almighty God, in such sort that men may stumble at them, but cannot remove them, may pull at them, but cannot pull them up:" therefore he thinketh the pope cannot err; which is a very bad consequence. For the infallibility of judgment in the pope is not mentioned among the inviolable privileges of the Church of Rome, and therefore the privileges of that Church may be inviolable, and yet the pope subject to error: neither hath Nicholas one word of the popes not erring. The testimonies of Leo the Ninth², and Innocentius the Third³, as being late and partial in their own cause, may justly be excepted against, yet do they not prove the thing in question. For they speak of the see and

auctoritas."—Hadrian. ad Concil. Rom. In Concil. Constant. iv. General. viii. Act. 7. [Labbe, Tom. x. col. 597.]

¹ "Privilegia istius sedis perpetua sunt, divinitus radicata, atque plantata; impingi possunt, transferri non possunt: trahi possunt, evelli non possunt. Quæ ante imperium vestrum fuerunt, permanent, Deo gratias, hactenus illibata; manebuntque post vos, et quousque Christianum nomen prædicatum fuerit, illa subsistere non cessabunt. . . . Nam et inter cætera is per quem nobis præcipue ista sunt privilegia collata, 'Tu aliquando conversus,' audivit a Domino, 'confirma fratres tuos.'" —Epist. Nicol. I. ad Michael. Imp. [Labbe, Tom. ix. col. 1334, 5.]

² "Nimirum solus est, pro quo ne deficeret fides ejus, Dominus et Salvator asseruit se rogasse, dicens, 'Rogavi pro te,' &c. Quæ venerabilis et efficax oratio obtinuit quod hactenus fides Petri non defecit, nec defectura creditur in throno illius."—Leo IX. Epist. ad Petr. Antioch. [Labbe, Tom. xi. col. 1345.]

³ "Majores ecclesiæ causas, præsertim articulos fidei contingentes, ad Petri sedem referendas intelligit, qui novit. . . . pro eo Dominum exorasse, ne deficeret fides ejus."—Innocent. III. Epist. ad Episc. Arelat. et habetur cap. 'Majores.' Extra. de Baptismo et ejus effectu. [Greg. IX. Decretal. Lib. iii. tit. 42. cap. 3. col. 1276, Par. 1612.]

throne of Peter, in which the faith may continue without failing (though the popes err and seek to subvert the same) so long as any other that are to govern the throne with them persevere in the true faith.

Wherefore from the prayer of Christ made for Peter, that his faith should not fail, they descend to other proofs taken from the promise made to Peter by Christ, that upon him he would build his Church¹, and his mandate requiring him to feed his sheep, and to feed his lambs²; which are too weak to persuade us that the pope cannot err, or is more privileged than other bishops in this respect. First, because it is most clear and evident, and confessed by our adversaries themselves, that the Church was builded upon all the apostles as well as upon Peter, and there is no kind of feeding of Christ's sheep and flock that cometh not within the compass of that office and commission which the other apostles had in common with him: as I have elsewhere³ showed at large. Secondly, because Peter and his colleagues were foundation stones upon which the Church was builded; in that their doctrine was received by immediate and undoubted revelation, without mixture of error, upon which the faith of all aftercomers was to stay itself: none of which things agree to the Roman bishop. So that it is no way necessary that there should be the same infallibility of judgment in him that was in Peter, and in his colleagues. Thirdly, because we know, and all that are in their right wits do acknowledge, that a man may be a pastor in the Church of God, and yet subject to error; and that therefore Christ's requiring Peter to do the duty of a pastor will not prove that the pope cannot err.

Wherefore from the Scriptures they pass to the fathers: and among them first they produce Theodoret, who in his epistle to Renatus a presbyter⁴, saith, "that among other things, the reason why the Roman Church hath a kind of chieftly among other Churches, is because it hath ever remained free from heresy." From whence I think hardly any

¹ Matt. xvi. 18.

² John xxi. 15—17.

³ Chap. xxii. [p. 149 supra.]

⁴ "Ἐχει γὰρ ὁ πανάγιος θρόνος ἐκεῖνος τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησιῶν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν διὰ πολλὰ, καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων, ὅτι αἵρετικῆς μεμένηκε δυσωδίας ἀμύητος, καὶ οὐδεὶς τὰναντία φρονῶν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἐκάθισεν." —Theodoret. [Epist. cxvi. Tom. iv. p. 1197, Hal. 1772.]

good proof can be drawn of the popes not erring. For how will this consequence ever be made good? There are many things that make the see of Rome great, as the greatness of the city, the empire, the sepulchres of those common fathers and doctors of truth, Peter and Paul, those two great lights, that rose in the East, and cast forth their beams into all parts of the world, but set in the West; and sundry other things, and among them the felicity and happiness of it, that till the time of Theodoret no heresy ever prevailed in it: therefore the bishop of Rome can never err: seeing Theodoret doth not dispute what may be, but sheweth only, what by the happy providence of God had been: and besides speaketh not precisely of the bishop of Rome, but of the Roman see¹, including the whole company of the bishops of the West adhering to him: which was a great part of the whole Christian Church, and more glorious than the rest, for that it was more free from heretical novelties in those times than they. To Theodoret they add Saint Augustine², who saith, “the succession of bishops from Peter’s chair to his time, is that rock against the which the proud gates of hell cannot prevail.” His meaning is, that what all those bishops have constantly and successively taught as true, must needs be true, and what they have impugned as false, must needs be false; seeing it is impossible that any error, or the impugning of any truth, should have been found successively in all the bishops of that or any other apostolical Church whatsoever. But what is this to the popes not erring? Surely as little as that of Gelasius in his epistle to Anastasius the emperor³, that “the

¹ “Quasi totam Europam et Africæ magnam partem patriarchatus Romanus sub se habet.”—Nicol. de Cusa, Concord. Cathol. Lib. II. cap. 7, [p. 719.]

“Est omnium episcoporum unus episcopatus, una cathedra, in qua primo sedet Romanus.”—[Id. Lib. I. cap. 14, p. 707, Bas. 1565.]

² “Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede,
Et in ordine illo patrum, quis cui successit videte:
Ipsa est petra, quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ.”
—August. in Psalm. contra partem Donati.
[Tom. IX. col. 7. E.]

³ “Hoc est quod apostolica sedes magnopere cavet, ut quoniam mundi radix est apostoli gloriosa confessio, nulla rima pravitatis, nulla prorsus contagione maculetur. Nam si (quod Deus avertat, et quod fieri non posse confidimus) tale aliquid proveniret, unde cuiquam

glorious confession of the apostle Peter, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' is the root of all the faith and piety of the whole world: and that therefore the apostolic see carefully looketh unto it, that no chink be made in it, and that it be not spotted with any contagion; for that if it should, there were no means of resisting any error." But because this maketh not for them, the cardinal helpeth the matter with an untruth, saying, that Gelasius proveth that the see of Rome cannot err, because the confession of it is the root of all the faith and piety that is in the world: whereas he neither goeth about to prove the one, nor speaketh any word of the other; but of the excellency of the confession that Peter made, the necessity of preserving it inviolable, and the care of the see of Rome, in and before his time, for the safe keeping of the same. Wherefore let us come to the places that are cited to this purpose out of Gregory's epistles, which show plainly they are past shame that manage the pope's affairs, and defend his cause. For whereas Gregory saith¹, that "if he that claimeth to be universal bishop do fall, all the whole Church is overthrown, and that therefore there must be no such universal bishop; and particularly sheweth by the grievous heresies that prevailed in the Church of Constantinople, how ill it would have been for the Churches of God, if the bishops thereof had been universal bishops, as they sought to be:" they bring this place to prove that the pope cannot err: whereas they should have brought it to show, how dangerous it is that there should be any one universal bishop, such as their pope desireth to be; and that therefore (as Cyprian² *resistere auderemus errori.*)—Gelas. Epist. ad Anastas. Imp. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 309.]

¹ "Certe multos Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ in hæreseos voraginem incidisse novimus sacerdotes, et non solum hæreticos, sed etiam hæresiarchas factos.

"Si igitur illud nomen in ea ecclesia sibi quisquam arripit quod apud bonorum omnium iudicium fecit, universa ergo ecclesia, quod absit, a statu suo corrui, quando is qui appellatur universalis cadit."—Greg. Lib. iv. Epist. xxxii. [Al. Lib. v. Epist. xx. Tom. ii. col. 748, 9.]

² "Idcirco, frater carissime, copiosum corpus est sacerdotum, concordiae mutuæ glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresin facere et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri, et quasi pastores utiles et misericordes, oves Dominicas in gregem colligant."—Cyprian. Epist. lxxvii. [Al. lxxviii. p. 178.]

observeth) Almighty God, wisely foreseeing what evils might follow such universality of power and jurisdiction in one man, ordained that there should be a great number of bishops joined in equal commission, that so if some fell, the rest might stand and keep the people from a general downfall. The next allegation is out of the epistle to Eulogius bishop of Alexandria, whereby the reader may see with what conscience these Jesuited papists do cite the writings of the fathers. The words of Gregory are these¹: "Your most sweet holiness hath uttered many things in your letters concerning Peter's chair, saying, that he yet sitteth in it in his successors: I truly do acknowledge myself to be unworthy, not only to be in the number of those that sit as rulers, but of them that stand to be ruled. But I therefore willingly accept whatsoever you say, because he hath spoken to me of Peter's chair, that sitteth in Peter's chair; and although it no way pleaseth or delighteth me to be specially honoured, yet I greatly rejoiced, because what you attributed to me you gave to yourselves. For who knoweth not that the holy Church is firmly established in the soundness of the prince of the apo-

¹ "Suavissima mihi sanctitas vestra multa in epistolis suis de sancti Petri apostolorum principis cathedra locuta est, dicens, quod ipse in ea nunc usque in suis successoribus sedeat. Et quidem ego indignum me esse non solum in honore præidentium, sed etiam in numero stantium agnosco. Sed cuncta quæ dicta sunt, in eo libenter accepi quod ille mihi de Petri cathedra locutus est, qui Petri cathedram tenet. Et cum me specialis honor nullo modo delectet, valde tamen lætatus sum quia vos, sanctissimi, quod mihi impendistis vobismetipsis dedistis. Quis enim nesciat sanctam ecclesiam in apostolorum principis soliditate firmatam, qui firmitatem mentis traxit in nomine, ut Petrus a petra vocaretur; cui veritatis voce dicitur, 'Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum.' Cui rursus dicitur, 'Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.' Iterumque, 'Simon Johannis, amas me? Pasce oves meas.' Itaque cum multi sint apostoli, pro ipso tamen principatu sola apostolorum principis sedes in auctoritate convaluit, quæ in tribus locis unius est. Ipse enim sublimavit sedem, in qua etiam quiescere et præsentem vitam finire dignatus est. Ipse decoravit sedem in qua evangelistam discipulum misit. Ipse firmavit sedem in qua septem annis, quamvis discessurus sedit. Cum ergo unus et unius sit sedes, cui ex auctoritate divina tres nunc episcopi præident, quidquid ego de vobis boni audio, hoc mihi imputo. Si quid de me boni creditis hoc vestris meritis imputate."—Id. Lib. vi. Epist. xxxvii. [Al. Lib. vii. Epist. xl. [Tom. ii. col. 887, 8.]

stles? whose firmness his name doth show: for he is named Peter of *Petra*, a rock, to whom the voice of verity saith, 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and thou being converted, confirm thy brethren:' and again, 'Simon Joanna, lovest thou me? feed my sheep.' Wherefore though there were many apostles, yet in respect of the chieftly he had, the chair of Peter, chief of the apostles, grew to be in greater authority than the rest, which is the chair of one apostle in three places. For he exalted the see, in which he was pleased to rest, and to end this present life; he beautified that see, wherein he left the evangelist his disciple; and he firmly established that see, in which he sat seven years, though with purpose in the end to leave it, and to depart from it. Whereas therefore there is the see of one, and that but one, wherein three bishops by God's appointment do sit to rule, whatsoever good I hear of you, I account it mine own; and what you persuade yourselves of me, think that you also are worthy of the same." If this epistle prove that the pope cannot err, it proveth likewise that the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch are free from error. For all these succeed that great apostle Saint Peter, (to whom Christ said, "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and, "Thou being turned, confirm thy brethren:" and again, "Lovest thou me? feed my sheep") as well as the pope. All these sit in Peter's chair: Peter's chair is in Alexandria, and at Antioch, as well as at Rome: and whatsoever they that are bishops of Alexandria and Antioch attribute to the bishop of Rome, they may lawfully assume to themselves; seeing they are worthy of the same, as Gregory in this place telleth us.

Wherefore, seeing not only fathers and councils, but even popes also (in whose defence he writeth) fail him, the cardinal flieth for help to the priests of Aaron's order, and goeth about to prove that the pope cannot err, because the high priest had in his breastplate Urim and Thummim¹, light and perfection, or doctrine and truth, as he will have the Hebrew word translated, importing (as he supposeth) that he could not err in the understanding of the law of God. Whereupon (as he thinketh) God commanded all those that any way doubted of the meaning of his law, to go up to the high

¹ Exod. xxviii. 30.

priest, and to seek to be satisfied by him, saying, "They shall judge true judgment unto thee¹." Lyra, in his annotations upon this place, reporteth², that there was a certain gloss of the Hebrews, that if the high priest should tell them, that their right hand were their left, or their left their right, they were to hold it good and right. The like opinion it seemeth the Romanists have of the pope. But Lyra in that place condemneth the folly of those Jews that so thought, because the sentence of no man, of what authority soever he be, is to be admitted, if it contain a manifest untruth and error: which he saith is evident out of the very text itself, in that it is said, "They shall judge unto thee true judgment; and thou shalt do whatsoever they shall say unto thee that are over the place that the Lord hath chosen, and whatsoever they shall teach thee according to his laws³." Whereby it appeareth, that if they speak that which is untrue, or manifestly depart from the law, they are not to be heard. The author of the ordinary Gloss agreeth with Lyra, saying⁴, "Note that the Lord requireth thee to do whatsoever the priests do teach thee according to the law, because otherwise thou art not to obey them, unless they teach thee according to the law." Whereupon Christ saith, "the scribes and Pharisees sit upon Moses' chair⁵," who yet (as the author of the interlineal Gloss noteth⁶) are not generally without exception to be hearkened unto, but then only when they utter and deliver *pertinentia ad cathedram*; that is, such things as beseem him to utter that sitteth in Moses' chair. So that to conclude this point, neither the Urim and Thummin in Aaron's

¹ Deut. xvii. 9.

² "Hic dicit glossa Hebraica: 'Si dixerit tibi quod dextera tua sit sinistra, vel sinistra dextera, talis sententia est tenenda;' quod patet manifeste esse falsum: quia sententia nullius hominis cujuscunque sit auctoritatis est tenenda si contineat manifeste falsitatem vel errorem; et hoc patet per hoc quod præmittitur in textu: 'Judicabit tibi judicii veritatem,' et postea subditur; 'Et docuerint te juxta legem ejus.' Ex quo patet quod si dicant falsum, vel declinant a lege Dei, manifeste non sunt audienda."—Lyra, in loc.

³ ver. 10.

⁴ "Nota, non dicitur tibi ut obedias, nisi juxta legem Domini."—Glossa Ordinaria, ibid. [Tom. i. col. 1567, Antv. 1634.]

⁵ Matt. xxiii. 2.

⁶ *Quæcunque*. Ad cathedram pertinentia.—Gloss. Interlin. in loc. [Tom. v. col. 377.]

breastplate, nor the mandate of Almighty God to go up to the sons of Aaron to seek judgment and justice, prove that they could not err; and therefore the pope is still in as bad case as ever he was.

Wherefore finding no help in the tribe of Levi, nor in the house of Aaron, they betake themselves to experience, and are in good hope to prove out of the experience of former times that the pope cannot err. First, because (as they say) whatsoever the pope condemned at any time as heretical, was ever holden to be so by the whole Church; and many heresies were never condemned any otherwise but by his judgment only. Secondly, because never any pope was an heretic, whereas all other principal sees and Churches have had bishops not only erring, but teaching and professing heresy. The instances that Bellarmine giveth of heresies and heretics condemned by the pope, and rejected for such by the Church, only because he condemned them, are the Pelagians, Priscillianists, Jovinian, and Vigilantius, and their heresies. It is hard (I see) for a blackamoor to change his skin, for a leopard to put away his spots, or for a man, that hath long acquainted himself with false and unfaithful dealing, to learn to deal sincerely and truly. For touching the heretics mentioned by the cardinal, all the world knoweth they were condemned in synods by many bishops, and not by the private censure of the bishop of Rome alone. Nay, it is most certain that others showed more care and diligence in suppressing some of these heretics and their errors, than ever the Roman bishop did; which I will make to appear in the particulars, beginning with the Pelagians¹. Pelagius, the founder of these heretics, was

¹ "Pelagianorum est hæresis hoc tempore omnium recentissima a Pelagio monacho exorta. Quem magistrum Cœlestius sic secutus est, ut sectatores eorum Cœlestiani etiam nuncupantur."—August. De Hæres. [cap. 88. Tom. VIII. col. 25.]

"Hæresis Pelagiana Britannorum turbat fidem, qui a Gallicanis episcopis auxilium quærentes Germanum Altissiodorensis ecclesiæ episcopum et Lupum Trekasenum æque apostolicæ gratiæ antistitem fidei defensores accipiunt: confirmant antistites fidem verbo veritatis simul et miraculorum signis."—Bed. De Sex Ætat. Mund. Ann. 4402. [Tom. II. p. 114. Colon. Agripp. 1612.]

"Hic Pelagius ex magna Britannia oriundus, monachusque existens in partibus Orientis, tandem in patriam reversus, postquam errores suos alibi etiam sparserat, totam pene patriam suo infecit errore.

born in Great Britain, and becoming a monk in the east parts of the world, after he had sparsed his errors in other places abroad, returned home into his own country, and infected it almost wholly with his heresy. Hereupon the Britains sought help and direction of the French bishops, because learning at that time flourished more among them than it did among the Britains; who willing to reach forth their helping hands to their neighbours and brethren in this time of their need, sent unto them Germanus and Lupus, bishops and brethren, defenders of the catholic faith, who cleared the isle from the Pelagian heresy, and confirmed it in the faith both by the word of truth, and signs and miracles. Besides this condemnation of Pelagius by the French and Britains, there were sundry councils holden to condemn both him and his wicked heresies, in Palestine, at Carthage, at Milevis, and at Arausicum; and it is most certain, that the Church of God, and all posterities, are more bound to St Augustine for clearing the points of doctrine questioned by the Pelagians, than to any bishop of Rome whatsoever. So that it is most untrue that the Pelagians were condemned only by the bishop of Rome: for other were as forward in that business as he; yea, the Africans¹ were more forward than the Romans, and drew them into the fellowship of the same work with themselves. The like may be said of the Priscillianists; for it is more than evident out of the council of Bracar, that they were not condemned by the bishop of Rome alone, but by many synods: for it is there reported, that Leo² did write by Turibius, notary

Quum autem Angli pro hac re favorem et auxilium peterent a Gallicanis episcopis, eo quod clarior apud eos esset doctrina, Germanum et Lupum episcopos et fratres (ut ait Beda in libro de ratione temporum) catholicæ fidei defensores accipiunt, qui antistites insulam ab hæresi Pelagiana expurgarunt, eam confirmantes in fide et verbo veritatis, et miraculorum signis. Vixit sub Honorio et Theodosio juniore. Contra hunc Pelagium fuerunt duo concilia celebrata, unum Carthaginense, et aliud Milevitanum."—Alphons. a Castro, contr. Hæres. Lib. II. [col. 118, Par. 1571.]

¹ See Epist. xcv. [Al. clxxvii.] Inter Epist. Augustini. [Tom. II. col. 622.]

² "Eo tempore quo in his regionibus nefandissima Priscillianæ sectæ venena serpebant, beatissimus papa urbis Romæ Leo, qui quadragesimus fere extitit apostoli Petri successor, per Turribium notarium sedis suæ ad synodum Gallicianæ contra impiam Priscilliani sectam

of the see apostolic, to the synod of Galitia, at what time the heresy of the Priscillianists began to spread in those parts; and that, by his prescription and appointment, they of Tarracon, of Carthage, of Portugal, and Bœtica, met in council, and composing a rule of faith against the heresy of the Priscillianists, containing certain chief heads of Christian doctrine, directed the same pattern of right belief to the bishop of Bracar, that then was: which heads of Christian doctrine were recited in the first council of Bracar, and the heresy of the Priscillianists thereupon more distinctly and particularly condemned than ever before. In all which proceedings we may see that the pope doth nothing of himself alone, but being patriarch of the West, and hearing of a dangerous heresy spreading in some Churches subject to him, he causeth the bishops under him to meet in councils, and to condemn the same. Which (as I think) will not prove that the pope alone condemned heresies, or that some heresies were rejected only because the pope condemned them, or that the pope cannot err, which is the thing in question. Touching Jovinian and Vigilantius, their errors are so uncertainly reported, some attributing to them one thing, and some another, and some condemning them for things for which they were not to be condemned, that it is hard to say by what lawful authority, or by whom they were condemned: but that in their errors justly disliked, they were condemned only by the bishops of Rome, and therefore taken to be heretics by the whole universal Church, our adversaries will never be able to prove. That the errors attributed unto them are uncertainly reported, it appeareth, in that Augustine¹ chargeth Jovinian with two dangerous and wicked assertions, touching the denial of the perpetual virginity of the blessed virgin the mother of our Lord, and the parity of

scripta sua direxit. Cujus etiam præcepto Tarraconenses et Carthaginenses episcopi, Lusitani quoque et Bœtici, facto inter se concilio regulam fidei contra Priscillianam hæresim cum aliquibus capitulis conscribentes, ad Balconium tunc hujus Bracarensis ecclesiæ præsulem direxerunt.—Concil. Bracar. i. [Al. ii. Labbe, Tom. vi. col. 517.]

¹ “A Joviniano quodam monacho orta est ista hæresis ætate nostra cum adhuc juvenes essemus. Hic omnia peccata, sicut stoici philosophi, paria esse dicebat, nec posse peccare hominem lavacro regenerationis accepto, nec aliquid prodesse jejunia, vel a cibis aliquibus abstinentiam. Virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisse corruptam.”—August. De Hæres. cap. 82. [Tom. viii. col. 24.]

sins : whereof Hierome (who yet was not like to have spared him) maketh no mention. And that they were in some things unjustly condemned, it is evident; first, in that Hierome¹ blameth Jovinian for saying, that married persons, virgins, and widows, if they differ not in other works of virtue, and therein excel one another, are of equal merit; which the best learned both of the fathers and schoolmen do approve, as I have elsewhere showed at large². Secondly, in that he so bitterly inveigheth against Vigilantius³ for disliking the pernoctations in the cemeteries and places of saints' burial, used in ancient times; which a council⁴, for the same reasons that moved Vigilantius to dislike them, took wholly away, and forbade them to be used any more; and the Roman Churches have long since disused. But that the pope's peremptory condemning of an error in matter of faith, was not taken in ancient times to be a sufficient demonstration that they were heretics that defended such errors after his condemning of the same, it is evident, in that Austin⁵ saith, that the Churches might doubt still touching the matter of rebaptization, because in the times of Stephen who condemned it, and Cyprian who urged it, there was no general council to end the controversy between them: and in that, after the peremptory forbidding and condemning of rebaptization by Stephen bishop of Rome, Cyprian and his col-

¹ "Dicit [Jovinianus] virgines, viduas, et maritas, quæ semel in Christo totæ sunt, si non discrepent cæteris operibus, ejusdem esse meriti."—Hieron. advers. Jovinian. Lib. i. [Tom. ii. col. 241.]

² Book III. chap. xxx. [Tom. i. p. 297. supra.]

³ "De vigiliis et pernoctationibus in basilicis martyrum sæpe celebrandis, in altera epistola . . . respondi breviter. Quod si eas æstimas respuendas, &c."—Hieron. advers. Vigilant. [Tom. ii. col. 396.]

⁴ "Cereos per diem placuit in cœmeterio non incendi: inquietandi enim spiritus sanctorum non sunt. Qui hæc non observaverint arceantur ab ecclesiæ communione.

"Placuit prohiberi ne feminæ in cœmeterio pervigilent: eo quod sæpe sub obtentu orationis latenter scelera committant."—Concil. Eliber. Can. xxxiv., xxxv. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 996.]

⁵ "Illis temporibus, antequam plenarii concilii sententia quid in hac re sequendum esset totius ecclesiæ consensio confirmasset, visum est ei cum ferme octoginta co-episcopis suis Africanarum ecclesiarum, omnem hominem qui extra ecclesiæ catholicæ communionem baptizatus fuisset oportere ad ecclesiam venientem denuo baptizari. . . . non se ille tamen a cæteris diversa sentientibus separata communione disjunxit."—August. De Bapt. Lib. i. cap. 18. [Tom. ix. col. 93.]

leagues still persisted in the practice of it, and in urging the necessity of it; and yet were never branded with the mark and note of heresy, but ever were and still are reputed catholics. Bellarmine¹, to avoid the force of this argument, feareth not to say, contrary to his own knowledge, that Stephen and his adherents never determined the question of rebaptization. But that he did, (and that in most peremptory sort and manner) it is more clear and evident than that the sun shineth at noon. For Firmilianus², a famous learned bishop, chargeth him that he caused great dissensions throughout all the Churches of the world; that he grievously sinned, in that he divided himself from so many flocks of Christ's sheep; that he was a schismatic; that he had forsaken the communion of ecclesiastical unity: willing him not to deceive himself, but to be well assured, that in thinking he could put all other from the communion, he had put himself out of the communion of all; that he brake the bands of unity with many bishops in all parts of the world, as well in the East, as in the South with the Africans, not admitting such as came from them unto him into his presence, or to any speech with him; and farther commanding the brethren, that none of them should receive them to house. So that he not only denied the peace of the Church, and the communion of Christians unto them, but the entering under the roof of any man's house that would be ruled by him; and that thus he held the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, rejecting them as damnable miscreants that dissented from him, and calling blessed Cyprian a false Christ, a false apostle, and a deceitful labourer or workman.

¹ "Sine dubio Stephanus papa non definivit tanquam de fide hæreticos non rebaptizandos, licet jussit non rebaptizari."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 7. [p. 399.]

² "Lites et dissensiones quantas parasti per ecclesias totius mundi. Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti. Excidisti enim teipsum: noli te fallere. Siquidem ille est vere schismaticus qui se a communione ecclesiasticæ unitatis apostatam facit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstineri posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti."

"Non pudet Stephanum talibus adversus ecclesiam patrociniū præstare, et propter hæreticos asserendos fraternitatem scindere: insuper et Cyprianum pseudo-christum et pseudo-apostolum et dolosum operarium dicere."—Firmilian. inter Epist. Cyprian. Epist. lxxv. [p. 228.]

And Dionysius¹, a famous and worthy bishop, reporteth that he wrote concerning Helenus and Firmilianus, and all the bishops in Cilicia, Cappadocia, and Galatia, and all the bordering countries, that he would not communicate with them for the same cause of rebaptization : which yet (as he saith) was agreed on in many very great synods of bishops. If this be not sufficient to prove that Stephen determined the question of rebaptization, I know not what can be. For first, he commanded that none should be rebaptized when they returned from the societies and profane conventicles of heretics, but that they should be admitted with the only imposition of hands. Secondly, he delivered his own opinion, that rebaptization was unlawful, confidently, as having so learned of his elders, and not in doubting manner. And thirdly, he rejected all them from his communion that thought and practised otherwise than he did, as it appeareth by the testimonies of Firmilianus and Dionysius ; so that it is strange that Bellarmine should be able so to harden his forehead, as not to blush when he saith, that Stephen did not define any thing touching the question of rebaptization ; that he did not make it a matter of faith, and necessary to be believed of all ; and that he did not excommunicate those that were otherwise minded, but only threatened them that he would so do. It is true indeed, that Cyprian, howsoever he definitively delivered in a council of bishops what he was persuaded men were to believe and practise touching rebaptization, and protested against Stephen, as a proud, ignorant, and unadvised man ; yet did not urge this his decree so as to reject from his communion all that should dislike it ; but left every bishop to his own judgment, as being to give an account to God only. But how the Jesuits can defend, against all the former proofs, that Stephen's proceedings were like to those of Cyprian, and that he also left every man to his own judgment, and rejected no man from his communion for dissenting from him, I cannot see. By that which hath been said, it appeareth that the ancients did not think everything to be heresy that the Roman bishops

¹ “Ὁ Διονύσιος περὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου λέγει ταῦτα. Ἐπεστάλκει μὲν οὖν πρότερον καὶ περὶ Ἑλένου καὶ περὶ Φιρμιλιάνου καὶ πάντων τῶν τε ἀπὸ τῆς Κιλικίας καὶ Καππαδοκίας καὶ Γαλατίας, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐξῆς ὁμορούντων ἔθνων ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς αἵρετικούς, φησιν, ἀναβαπτίζουσι.”—Euseb. H. E. VII. 5.

defined to be so; and that therefore they did not think him free from danger of erring. “Neither need we to marvel,” saith Bellarmine, “if in former times men had not learned this lesson, seeing to this day they are not judged to be heretics that think the pope may err.” Yet so kind is he to Cyprian, that (whereas Austin excuseth him in his error, and thinketh his sin was venial,) he pronounceth¹ he sinned mortally, and so without particular repentance (whereof there is little likelihood) perished everlastingly, notwithstanding his martyrdom. The reason of this difference of the censures of Austin and Bellarmine is, because Austin looked only or principally to his error, but Bellarmine to his contempt of the bishop of Rome’s decrees and determinations.

CHAPTER XLIII.

OF SUCH POPES AS ARE CHARGED WITH HERESY, AND HOW THE ROMANISTS SEEK TO CLEAR THEM FROM THAT IMPUTATION.

HAVING examined our adversaries’ proofs of the infallibility of the pope’s judgment, taken from the acceptation of his judgment as right and good by all the world, whensoever he defined anything; let us come to the other proof of the same, taken from the felicity of the Roman see in former times. Ruffinus saith², that before his time no heresy had ever taken beginning in the Roman Church; but our adversaries proceed farther, and fear not to pronounce, after sixteen hundred years³, that no heretic did ever sit in the see of Rome: which their proud brag will be found much more vain than

¹ “Ex altera tamen parte videtur mortaliter peccasse, cum præcepto expresso apostolico non paruerit, et sine modo pontificem recte sentientem vexaverit.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² “In ecclesia urbis Romæ hoc non deprehenditur factum; quod ego propterea esse arbitror, quod neque hæresis ulla illic sumpsit exordium.”—Ruffin. Expos. Symbol. [Ad calc. Cypr. p. 17, Oxon. 1682.]

³ “Nos non negamus posse pontifices exemplo suo præbere occasionem errandi, sed illud negamus posse eos ex cathedra errorem aliquem sequendum toti ecclesiæ præscribere.”—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 8. [p. 400.]

true, and many unanswerable instances will be brought of wicked heretics possessing that chair. Tertullian in his book against Praxeas¹ speaketh of a bishop of Rome, but nameth him not, that admitted and allowed the prophecies of Montanus and his two prophetesses, Prisca and Maximilla, and held communion with the Montanists till he was dissuaded by Praxeas: who (as he saith) caused the prophecies of Montanus and his prophetesses to be banished, and brought in heresy, who banished their Paraclete, and crucified the Father. But because Tertullian was a Montanist, and wrote partially in things that concerned them (though Rhenanus² say the bishop of Rome did Montanize), yet for my part (no other history reporting any such thing of any Roman bishop) I will not upon Tertullian's bare word charge any of them with any such heresy.

But (howsoever we think of Tertullian's report) we find in the Council of Sinuessa³, in the Pontifical⁴, in the Epistle of Nicholas the First to Michael the emperor, in Platina⁵ and others, that Marcellinus did sacrifice unto idols, and so at least in outward action showed himself an infidel; which is a higher degree of impiety than heresy. If it be said, he committed that execrable act of idolatry, not out of any mis-persuasion of his mind, but fear of death, it will be replied, that if the passion of fear be able to work so ill effects in popes, as the utter abnegation of Christianity, and the professing of themselves to be Pagan infidels by public outward acts of idolatry, there is little reason to be given but that some

¹ "Idem tunc episcopum Romanum, agnoscentem jam prophetias Montani, Priscæ, Maximillæ, et ex ea agnitione pacem ecclesiæ, Asiæ, et Phrygiæ inferentem, falsa de ipsis prophetis et ecclesiis eorum ad-severando, et præcessorum ejus auctoritates defendendo, coegit et litteras pacis revocare jam emissas, et a proposito recipiendorum charismatum concessare. Ita duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit; prophetiam expulit, et hæresim intulit, Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit."—Tertull. advers. Prax. [cap. i. p. 501, Par. 1675.]

² Annot. in Tert. contra Praxeam. [Ad calc. Tertull. p. 108, Franek. 1597.]

³ Concil. Sinuessan. [Labbe, Tom. i. col. 956, sqq.]

⁴ "Ipse Marcellinus ad sacrificium ductus est, ut thurificaret: quod et fecit."—Damas. Pontifical. [Apud Labbe, col. 947.]

⁵ "Marcellinus pontifex ad sacrificia gentium ductus, cum minis instarent carnifices ut thura diis exhiberet, metu perterritus Deos alienos adoravit."—Platina in Marcellino. [p. 39.]

other sinister and vile affection may carry them as far to make profession of heresy, a thing not so ill as paganism. Wherefore Baronius¹, to prevent the worst, and to make all sure, inclineth to deny that ever Marcellinus committed any such act of idolatry, and discredith the report of the council of Sinuessa, in which he is said to have been condemned. Wherein he doth as much disadvantage the Roman cause another way, in depriving his friends of so good an authority as the resolution of that sacred synod, that *prima sedes a nemine judicatur*, that is, that "the first see is judged of none:" as he advangeth it in the clearing of Marcellinus; and therefore he is rightly blamed by Binius² for his inconsiderate rashness in this behalf.

But that we may be assured that popes may be heretics as well as infidels, we have the confession of as good a man as Baronius acknowledging the same. For Bellarmine³ saith, that Liberius (howsoever for a long time he continued constant in the profession of the true faith, so that for the same his constancy he was banished, and another by the Arian faction put into his place,) yet in the end weary of banishment, he was brought to subscribe to heresy, and was in his outward courses an heretic, whatsoever his heart was, whereof God only is the searcher; so that justly as an heretic he was condemned, and pronounced to be no pope any longer by his own clergy. This he proveth out of the testimonies of Athanasius⁴ and Hierome⁵, who say expressly, that being weary of his continuance in banishment, he was at last brought to subscribe to heresy; and Hilary⁶, who speaking to Constantius the wicked

¹ Annal. Ann. 303. Num. 100. [Tom. III. p. 362. Lucæ, 1738.]

² Annot. in acta Conc. Sinuessani.

³ "Tametsi Liberius hæreticus non erat, tamen habebatur propter pacem cum Arianis factam hæreticus: et ex ea præsumptione merito potuit ei pontificatus abrogari: non enim tenentur homines aut possunt corda scrutari, sed quem externis operibus hæreticum esse vident, simpliciter hæreticum judicant, ac ut hæreticum damnant."—Bellarm. ubi supra. [p. 404.]

⁴ Athanas. in Epist. ad solitar. vitam agentes. [p. 441. not. 2. supra.]

⁵ Hieron. in Chronico, et in Catalog. Script. Eccles. in Fortunatiano. [ibid.]

⁶ "Vertisti deinde usque ad Romam bellum tuum, eripuisti illinc episcopum, et O te miserum, qui nescio an virum majore impietate relegaveris quam remiseris."—Hilar. advers. Constant. [§ 11, Tom. II. col. 571, Veron. 1730.]

Arian emperor, hath these words: "Afterwards thou didst turn the course of thy war against Rome, whence thou tookest the bishop, O wretched emperor! I can hardly say, whether thy impiety were greater in sending him into banishment, or in sending him home again:" thereby insinuating that he restored him upon very ill conditions. And that he was not restored but by some kind of consenting with the Arians, it is most clear, in that Sozomen¹ reporteth, that the Arian bishops assembled at Sirmium sent their letter to Felix, then bishop of Rome, and the clergy there, kindly to receive Liberius, and that both Felix and he might sit as bishops, and govern the Roman Church together; which they would never have done, if they had not found him tractable and yielding; yet could not these two bishops endure one the other long, notwithstanding these letters. And therefore Hierome² saith, that Liberius, impatient of any longer continuance in banishment, subscribed to heretical pravity, and so returned to Rome as a conqueror, and cast out Felix who had possessed himself of the episcopal chair, and put divers other of the clergy also out of the Church; and Bellarmine³ himself confesseth, he hath seen in the Vatican library manuscript epistles of Liberius, some written to the emperor, and some to the eastern bishops, wherein he signifieth plainly enough, that in the end he was content to yield to the will of the emperor. And besides, if the Romanists do not acknowledge that Liberius was a convicted heretic, (there being no other cause but heresy for which, as they think, a pope may lawfully be judged and deposed), they must put Felix, who was pope while Liberius yet lived, out of the number of popes, whom yet their church doth worship as a pope, saint, and a martyr. So that we see Liberius was justly judged and condemned as an heretic, and that seeing a pope, in that he becometh an heretic, ceaseth to be pope, he lost all the privileges that belong to Peter's successors, and so might decree for heresy: yea, I think there is no reasonable man but will confess, that his subscribing to heresy that is the head of the Church, is a decreeing for

¹ Sozom. Lib. iv. cap. 14.

² In Chronico, [p. 441. supra.]

³ "Præterea legi ipse epistolas Liberii manu scriptas ex Vaticana bibliotheca, quæ partim ad imperatorem, partim ad episcopos Orientales scriptæ erant, in quibus satis aperte significabat, se tandem imperatoris voluntati acquiescere voluisse."—Bellarm. ubi supra.

heresy. Now that he subscribed to heresy, we have the express testimony of Saint Hierome¹. After the banishment of Liberius by the means of Acatius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, who was a great man with Constantius the emperor, Felix, a deacon of the Church of Rome, was chosen bishop, and appointed to succeed him. This Felix (as Theodoret² testifieth) was a catholic, and held the profession of faith agreed on at Nice, but communicated freely with the Arians. Whereupon he was so much disliked by those that were catholics, that none of them would once enter into the house of prayer while he was within. For that, though he were not in persuasion and vocal profession a full Arian, yet by communicating with them, and being ordained by them, he consented to their wicked and heretical courses. Neither doth it appear by any history of credit, that ever he refused to communicate with the Arian heretics during the time he quietly possessed and enjoyed the bishopric of Rome. But the contrary is more than probable, because when Liberius subscribed, and was thereupon sent home with letters of commendation from the Arian bishops assembled at Sirmium³, they carefully provided for Felix his continuance in the episcopal office still, and desired that the violences and outrages committed in the time of his ordination (when the people for the love they bare to Liberius were in an uproar, and some of them were slain) might be forgotten, and that both of them might sit and govern the Church together as bishops of the place; which favour the Arian bishops would never have showed to Felix if he had disclaimed their communion. So that it is more than probable that he never forsook the communion of the Arian heretics. For Liberius returning as a conqueror, so soon as he came to Rome, cast him out of the Church, and shortly after he died; and therefore I cannot

¹ Hieron. in Catalog. Script. Ecclesiast. in Acacio. [p. 442. supra.]

² “Φίληξ ἦν ὄνομα τούτῳ, ὃς τὴν μὲν ἐκτεθεῖσαν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν ἄσυχον διεφύλαττε, τοῖς δὲ γε διαφθείρουσι ταύτην ἀδεῶς ἐκοινῶνει. Οὐδεὶς μὲντοι τῶν οἰκούντων τὴν Ῥώμην εἰς εὐκτήριον εἰσεληλύθεν οἶκον ἔνδον ὄντος ἐκείνου.” —Theodoret. H. E. II. 17.

³ “Γράφουσὶ τε προσδέξασθαι αὐτὸν οἱ ἐν Σιρμίῳ ἐπίσκοποι Φίληκι τῷ ἡγουμένῳ τότε τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῷ ἐνθάδε κλήρῳ. Ἀμφω δὲ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν ἐπιτροπεύειν θρόνον, καὶ κοινῇ ἱεῖσθαι μεθ’ ὁμονοίας, ἀμνηστία τε παραδοῦναι τὰ συμβάντα ἀνιὰ διὰ τὴν Φίληκος χειροτονίαν καὶ τὴν Λιβερίου ἀποδημίαν.” —Sozom. H. E. IV. 15.

see what reason the Romanists have to put this good man into the calendar of their pope-saints, whose entrance into the episcopal chair was not only schismatical (there being a catholic bishop yet alive, and suffering banishment for the catholic faith), but violent and bloody also; (for he got the place by the means of bloody heretics, making himself guilty of all the sins of those heretics with whom he communicated;) and of whose relinquishing and abandoning the communion and fellowship of the Arians there is no mention found in any author of credit, but in the author of the Pontifical¹ only, who hath as many lies as words in his narration concerning Felix. For first, he saith, he sate but one year, three months, and three days, whereas it is reported by Theodoret², that Liberius had been more than two years in banishment before suit was made to the emperor for his return; all which time Felix was pope. Secondly, he saith, Felix declared and published Constantius the son of Constantine to be an heretic, and that Constantius was rebaptized, or the second time baptized, by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, near unto Nicomedia; which thing is most false, as Binius³ in his annotations telleth us,

¹ “Felix natione Romanus ex patre Anastasio sedit annum unum, menses tres, dies tres. Hic declaravit Constantium filium Constantini hæreticum, et secundo rebaptizatum ab Eusebio Nicomediensi juxta Nicomediam in Aquilone villa. Et pro hoc declaratus ab eodem Constantio Constantini Augusti filio, martyrio coronatur, et capite truncatur. Hic fecit basilicam via Aurelia miliario ab urbe secundo, cum presbyterii honore fungeretur Qui etiam passus est in civitate Corona cum multis clericis et fidelibus occulte juxta muros urbis ad lacus Trajani, tertio Idus Novembris.”—Damas. Pontifical. [Apud Labbe, Tom. II. col. 991.]

² “Ο μὲν δὴ νικηφόρος [Λιβέριος] τῆς ἀληθείας ἀγωνιστὴς τὴν Θράκην ὥς προσετάχθη κατέλαβε. Δύο δὲ διεληλυθότων ἐτῶν, ὁ μὲν Κωνσταντῖος εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἀφίκετο. Αἱ δὲ τῶν ἐν τέλει καὶ ἀξιομάτων ὁμόζυγοι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐλιπάρουν ἰκετεῦσαι τὸν Κωνσταντίον, ἀποδοῦναι τὸν νομέα τῇ ποίμνῃ.”—Theodoret. H. E. II. 17.

³ “Constantium secundo rebaptizatum fuisse ab Eusebio Nicomediensi falsissimum est; tum quod Athanasius lib. de synodis et Socrates lib. II. cap. ult. affirmant eum tempore mortis ab Euzoio Ariano baptismo initiatum fuisse: tum quod Hilarius lib. de synod. post hæc tempora in eum invehatur, quod non regeneratus, ut ait, ecclesiis credendi formam præscribere auderet.”—Bin. in not. ad Vit. Felicis. [Apud Labbe, ubi supra.]

because both Athanasius¹ and Socrates² do affirm he was baptized by Euzoius, an Arian, when he was ready to die. And Hilarius³, after the time of this supposed baptism, inveigheth against him, for that not being baptized, he presumed to prescribe to the Church a form of faith. Thirdly, he saith, Felix built a certain Church whilst he was a presbyter, whereas it is certain that of a deacon he was made a bishop, and never lived in the degree of a presbyter. And fourthly, touching the death of Felix he is very uncertain and doubtful, and others speak nothing of his martyrdom at all. Hereupon, (as both Bellarmine⁴ and Binius⁵ report) in the time of Gregory the Thirteenth, in the year of our Lord 1582, where certain learned men in Rome were deputed to correct the martyrology, they were doubtful whether they should put his name into the new martyrology or not, seeing both his entrance into his bishopric was violent, bloody, and schismatical, and his end uncertain, and they inclined to leave it out; which they had done, if a certain marble chest had not been found in the church of Cosmas and Damianus, the 28th of July, the day before his wonted and accustomed feast, with this inscription in old characters: "Here lieth the body of Felix the pope and martyr, who condemned Constantius the here-

¹ "Κωνστάντιος μέχρι τέλους διαμείνας ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ, καὶ λοιπὸν ἀποθνήσκων, ἔδοξε βαπτίζεσθαι, οὐ παρὰ εὐσέβων ἀνδρῶν ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ Εὐζωίου τοῦ διὰ τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν οὐχ ἅπαξ ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις καθαιρεθέντος."—Athanas. De Synod. [§ 31. Tom. i. p. 748.]

² "Τούτου διαγγελθέντος ὁ βασιλεὺς Κωνστάντιος εἰς ἀγῶνα κατέστη· βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ Εὐζωίου ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐχώρει πόλεμον. Γενόμενος δὲ μεταξὺ Καππαδοκίας καὶ Κιλικίας ἐν Μόψου κρήναις ἐτελεύτα τὸν βίον, ὑπὸ φροντίδος ἀποπληξία ληφθεὶς, ἐν ὑπατείᾳ Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρεντίου, τῇ τρίτῃ τοῦ Νοεμβρίου μήνος."—Socrat. H. E. ii. 47.

³ "Credendi formam ecclesiis nondum regeneratus imponeret."—Hilar. De Synodis. [§ 78. Tom. ii. col. 506.]

⁴ "Cum Romæ ambigeretur anno 1582, deberet ne hic S. Felix in novo martyrologio collocari, casu inventa fuit arca marmorea in basilica SS. Cosmæ et Damiani, cum hac inscriptione in marmore incisa antiquis characteribus. 'Hic jacet corpus S. Felicis papæ et martyris, qui Constantium hæreticum damnavit.' Et incidit hæc inventio in diem 28 Julii, hoc est, pridie ejus diei quo celebrari solebat memoria hujus ipsius Felicis: quod non immerito divinitus contigisse creditum est."—Bellarm. ubi supra.

⁵ Annot. in Vit. Felicis. [ubi supra.]

tic." Whereby we see how little reason the Roman Church hath to worship this saint, and to admire the providence of God, in preserving this see apostolic from heresy; in that, as they would bear us in hand, Felix after he heard of the subscription of Liberius, who thereby ceased to be pope, condemned the Arians, was admitted by the Catholics, and became a true bishop, suffering death upon the return of Liberius; as if the very see did change the minds of all that sit in it, and make them good, how bad soever they were before; whereas Felix¹, being in his entrance a schismatic, in communion, if not in profession, an heretic, and in his ordination which was void, no bishop; and no history of credit reporting either his condemning Arianism, or his admission to be a bishop after the deposition of Liberius by the catholics, or what his end was; it appeareth that heretics and schismatics may possess the chair of Peter, and be worshipped for pope-saints after their death. But whatsoever became of Felix, they say Liberius after the death of Felix became a catholic, and got the love of the catholics; and so by their acceptation of him became a true bishop again, and in that state died. Thus do our adversaries seem to carry this matter very fairly, as if all were safe and well; whereas indeed they are in a very great strait; for either Liberius was an heretic before his return home, and justly deposed for heresy, or else Felix was never true bishop, and then their Church hath worshipped a schismatic as a pope-saint for the space of a thousand years: if he were an heretic, and justly deposed, (as to justify Felix they must be forced to confess) he could never be restored to the episcopal office and dignity again. For the canon of the Church is², that no catholic

¹ "Liberius qui post Julium, Marci, quem Sylvester præcesserat successorem, in urbe Roma per idem tempus sacerdotio fungebatur, in exilium traditur. Inque ejus locum Felix diaconus suus ab hæreticis subrogatur. Et non tam sectæ diversitate quam communionis et ordinationis convenientia maculatur."—Ruffin. Hist. Eccles. Lib. i. cap. 22. [Al. Euseb. H. E. interpr. Ruffin. Lib. x. cap. 22, Bas. 1528.]

² "In Alexandrina synodo constitutum est, ut exceptis auctoribus hæreseos quos error excusare non poterat, pœnitentes ecclesiæ sociarentur: non quod episcopi possint esse qui hæretici fuerant, sed quod constaret eos qui reciperentur hæreticos non fuisse."—Hieron. advers. Lucifer. [Tom. ii. col. 193.]

"Si qui presbyteri aut diaconi qui vel in ecclesia catholica prius

becoming an heretic, and being condemned by the Church for such a one, shall ever be received to ecclesiastical honour again: so that he could not die true pope, as our adversaries dream he did. Let them show us how they can clear themselves from sundry absurd contradictions in this point, and we will rest satisfied. For we do not deny but that he might repent of his subscribing to heresy, and die a catholic, though some of the testimonies that Bellarmine bringeth will scarce prove it.

The next pope that we find to have been touched with any suspicion of heresy is Anastasius the Second, whom the author of the Pontifical¹ taxeth. First, for that he communicated with Photius, a deacon of the Church of Thessalonica, that had communicated with Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, without the counsel of the bishops and presbyters of the catholic Church: which his inconsiderate action made many of the presbyters and clergy refuse to communicate with him. Secondly, for that he sought to restore Acacius, whom Felix and Gelasius his predecessors had condemned: for which fact he was suddenly stricken of God, in such sort that he died. To these Gratian² addeth another taxation, reprehending him for that he allowed the baptism and ordination of such as were baptized and ordained by Acacius after he was become an heretic. But because the baptism and ordination of heretics is holden good, and it appeareth by the epistle of Anastasius to Anastasius the emperor³, that Acacius was dead

ordinati fuerint, et postmodum perfidi et rebelles contra ecclesiam steterint, vel apud hæreticos a pseudo-episcopis et antichristis contra Christi dispositionem profana ordinatione promoti sunt, et contra altare unum atque divinum sacrificia foris falsa ac sacrilega offerre conati sint, eos quoque hac conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut communicent laici.—Cyprian. Lib. II. Epist. i. [Al. Epist. lxxii. p. 197.]

¹ “Multi clerici et presbyteri se a communione ipsius erexerunt, eo quod communicasset sine consilio episcoporum, vel presbyterorum, vel cleri cunctæ ecclesiæ catholicæ diacono Thessalonicensi nomine Photio, qui communis erat Acacio; et quia occulte voluit revocare Acacium, et non potuit. Qui nutu divino percussus est.”—Damas. Pontifical. [Apud Labbe, Tom. v. col. 403.]

² “Anastasius secundus favore Anastasii imperatoris, quos Acacius post sententiam in se prolatam sacerdotes vel Levitas ordinaverat, rite fungi acceptis officiis debere decrevit.”—Gratian. Decret. Dist. xix. cap. ‘Anastas.’ [Annot. in cap. ‘Ita Dominus.’ col. 103, Par. 1585.]

³ “Et prædecessor noster papa Felix, et etiam Acacius illic procul-

before he was bishop, and that he desired to have the name of Acacius rased out of the diptics of the Church, after his death; I will pass by this censure of the author of the Pontifical, and Gratian, as doubtful; and leaving Anastasius, come to Vigilius; who (as Liberatus¹ reporteth) to get the popedom, like a notable dissembling hypocrite, pretended at Rome to be a catholic, but in his letters to Theodora the empress, who was an heretic, condemned the catholic faith; and promised that if Sylverius might be thrust out, and he put into his place, he would restore Anthemius, bishop of Constantino-ple, rejected by Agapetus for heresy. Which being brought to pass by Theodora the empress, and Sylverius unjustly banished, he sat for a while as an anti-pope and an heretic. But when as Sylverius was dead, he professed himself a catholic, and refused to perform that he had promised to Theodora. Whether this man being an heretic in his outward profession at his entrance, and by such profession getting the popedom unjustly, schismatically, and as an anti-pope, could ever after be true pope, let our adversaries give us answer, when they have advisedly thought of it.

The next pope that is charged with heresy is Honorius the First, whom the Christian world, and not a few particular men only, condemned as a Monothelite. For in the sixth²

dubio sunt, ubi unusquisque sub tanto iudice non potest perdere sui meriti qualitatem.

“Precamur itaque clementiam vestram ut specialiter nomen taceatur Acacii.”—(‘Nomen Acacii e sacris diptychis expungi rogat.’—Bin. in loc.) [Anastas. Epist. ad Anastas. Imperat. [Labbe, Tom. v. col. 406, 7.]

¹ “Augusta [Theodora] vero vocans Vigilium Agapeti diaconum, profiteri sibi secreto ab eo flagitavit, ut si papa fieret, tolleretur synodum, et scriberet Theodosio Anthimo et Severo, et per epistolam suam eorum firmaret fidem; promittens dare ei præceptum ad Belisarium ut papa ordinaretur, et dari centenaria septem. Lubenter ergo suscepit Vigilium promissum ejus amore episcopatus et auri: et facta professione Romam profectus est: ubi veniens invenit Silverium papam ordinatum....Favore Belisarii ordinatus est Vigilium, Silverius autem in exilium missus....Vigilius autem timore Romanorum et avaritia patrocinate volebat sponsiones suas implere.”—Liberat. Breviar. cap. 22. [Galland. Biblioth. Pat. Tom. xii. p. 156.]

² “Συνεκβληθῆναι ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας καὶ συναναθεματισθῆναι συνείδομεν καὶ Ὁνόριον τὸν γενόμενον πάπαν τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ εὐρηκέναι ἡμᾶς διὰ τῶν γενομένων παρ’ αὐτοῦ γραμμάτων

general council his epistles to Sergius the heretic are publicly read and condemned, and he accursed as an heretic. The seventh¹ general council likewise doth anathematize Honorius, Sergius, Cyrus, and the other Monothelites. In the eighth² general council, called about the matter of difference between Ignatius and Photius, the acts of the council of the West under Adrian the Second are read and allowed; wherein Adrian professeth, that none of the inferior sees may judge the greater, and specially Rome, unless it be in case of heresy; in which case they of the East did anathematize and accurse Honorius: which yet (he saith) they would not have adventured to do, if the Roman Church had not gone before them in such condemnation of her own bishop. Pope Leo the Second, in his epistle to Constantine the emperor, which we find in the end of the sixth general council³, accurseth the same Honorius as an heretic and a wicked one, that defiled and polluted the apostolic chair with heresy. With Leo consenteth Tharasius bishop of Constantinople⁴, Theodorus bishop of Hierusalem⁵, Epiphanius in his disputation with Gregory⁶, in the sixth action of the seventh general council, Psellus⁷, Beda⁸,

πρὸς Σέργιον κατὰ πάντα τῇ ἐκείνου γνώμῃ ἐξακολουθήσαντα, καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβῆ κυρώσαντα δόγματα.—Concil. Constant. III. General. VI. Act. 13. [Labbe, Tom. VII. col. 977.]

¹ “Cum Ario, Eunomio, Macedonio, Apollinario, Nestorio, Eutychete, ac Dioscoro, Sergio, Honorio, atque cum omni eorum pessima secta connumeravit [dominus] turbulentum factionis eorum concilium.”—Concil. Nicæn. VII. General. VII. Act. 7. [Labbe, Tom. VIII. col. 1205, 32.]

² Actione 7. [p. 442. not. 3. supra.] ³ Leo. [Ib. not. 2.]

⁴ “Summittoque anathemati Cyrum, Sergium, Honorium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, et omnes consecratores eorum.”—Concil. VII. Act. 3. [Labbe, Tom. VIII. col. 814.]

⁵ “Sexta synodus....anathematizavit Sergium, Pyrrhum, Petrum, Cyrum, Honorium, Theodorum Pharanitanum, et Polychronium delirium senem.”—Theodor. Epist. Synodica quæ habetur in eadem VII^{mo}. Synod. Act. 3. [col. 831.]

⁶ “Sergius Constantinopolitanus, Cyrus Alexandrinus, Honorius Romanus, et qui circa ipsos sunt unam voluntatem in Christo dicentes, ut hæretici anathematizantur a catholica ecclesia.”—Epiphan. Dialog. In Synod. VII. Act. 6. [col. 1071.]

⁷ In Carm. De 7 Synodis. [Lin. 53. ad calc. epigramm. Cyri Theodori. 8vo. s. p. Basil. 1536.]

⁸ De 6 Ætatib. in Vita Constantini. [Tom. II. p. 116. Colon. Agripp. 1612.]

and the author of the Pontifical¹. These authorities may seem very sufficient to prove that Honorius was an heretic: yet so well are our adversaries affected to him, that they will rather discredit them all than suffer him to be spotted and disgraced; and therefore some of them say that the sixth general council is corrupted; and likewise the epistle of Leo the Second, in the end of it; and that the fathers in the seventh council were deceived by the sixth, as likewise pope Adrian with the whole Roman synod, and the other authors that concur with them in the condemnation of Honorius. Others think that indeed the sixth council condemned Honorius, but upon false information, and so erred in a matter of fact. Which conceit is no way probable. For that the fathers of the council proceeded not rashly, but caused the epistles of Honorius written to the heads of the faction of the Monothelites (for which he was suspected) to be openly read and examined². But (say they)³, first, these epistles haply were counterfeit; secondly, if they were not counterfeit, there is nothing in them contrary to the truth. Neither of these answers is sufficient. For first, that the epistles were not counterfeit, it appeareth by Maximus⁴, who answereth a place brought out of one of them, and sheweth the meaning of it, as from the secretary that wrote it, then living. Secondly, if these epistles had been counterfeit, the legates of Agatho present there would have taken exception to them, and not have consented to the condemnation of one of his predecessors upon counterfeit evidence. Neither is the second answer better than the first: for that the fathers assembled in a general council should not be able to understand the epistles of Honorius, and judge whether they were heretical or not, as well as the Jesuits now living, is very strange. But let

¹ In Vita Leonis. [Apud Labbe, Tom. vii. col. 1451.]

² Actione 12. [Labbe, col. 960. sqq.]

³ "Respondeo dupliciter. Primo fortasse illas epistolas esse confictas, et insertas concilio generali ab hæreticis.

"Secundo dico. In epistolis istis Honorii nullum contineri errorem."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 11. [p. 407.]

⁴ "Maximus, 'Utra harum literarum verior certiorque interpretatio habenda est, ejus ne scribæ qui nomine Honorii illas scripsit, præsertim cum idem adhuc superstes sit, omnisque virtutis splendore et religionis disciplina totius occidentis partes ornavit.'"—Dialog. Maximi cum Pyrrho, apud Bin. Concil. Tom. ii. [p. 1036.]

us suppose the Jesuits to have more wit than all those worthy bishops and fathers that were assembled in the sixth council, and let us see, by taking a view of the epistles themselves, whether they may be cleared from the error they have been charged with, or not. It is not to be denied but that Honorius, in these his epistles, confesseth¹, that the nature of God in Christ worketh the things that are divine; and the nature of man, the things that are human; without division, confusion, or conversion of one of them into another: and that the differences of these natures remain inviolable. But in that he denieth that there are two actions in Christ, the one of Deity, and the other of Humanity; in that he saith, it is absurd to think that where there are more natures than one, there must be more actions than one, and alloweth of Cyrus bishop of Alexandria, and Sergius bishop of Constantinople, who were Monothelites, rather than of Sophronius bishop of Jerusalem, a right worthy and learned bishop (who defended the truth against them both, and whose learned epistle to Sergius bishop of Constantinople, we find in the sixth general council²); it cannot be avoided but that he erred in matter of faith, in such sort as by consequence it overthroweth that distinction of the two natures of God and man in Christ which he seemed to acknowledge. Neither can it be cleared from suspicion of heretical and bad meaning, that he maketh it but a curiosity of philosophers to acknowledge a twofold action in Christ, and denieth that the fathers ever defined any such thing; whereas pope Martin the First³, in the

¹ “Ὁμολογούντες τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν μεσίτην Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐνεργούντα τὰ θεῖα, μεσιτευούσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τῆς ἐνωθείσης αὐτῷ τῷ Θεῷ λόγῳ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐνεργούντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἀφράστως καὶ μονογενῶς, προσληφθείσης τῆς σαρκὸς ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀσυγχύτως, τελείως [ὑπὸ] τῆς θεότητος.”—Honor. In Concil VI. Act. XII. [Labbe, col. 961.]

“Ἐξαιροῦντες οὖν τὸ σκάνδαλον τῆς νέας ἐφευρέσεως, οὐ δέον ἡμᾶς ὀρίζειν ἢ κηρύττειν μιὰν ἢ δύο ἐνεργείας, ἀλλ’ ἀντὶ μιᾶς, ἣν τινες λέγουσιν ἐνεργείαν, δέον ἡμᾶς τὸν ἓνα ἐνεργούντα Χριστὸν τὸν Κύριον ἐν ἑκατέραις ταῖς φύσεσιν ἀληθῶς ὁμολογεῖν. Καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν δύο ἐνεργείων ἐξαιρεθείσης τῆς προσηγορίας τῆς διπλῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτὰς μᾶλλον τὰς δύο φύσεις μεθ’ ἡμῶν κηρύξωσι, τουτέστι τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς τῆς προσληφθείσης, ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ προσώπῳ τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ καὶ πατρὸς, ἀσυγχύτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως ἐνεργούσας τὰ ἴδια.”—Id. In Act. 13. [col. 1004.]

² Act. 11. [col. 883, sqq.]

³ “Duas competenter naturas et operationes, sicut et voluntates,

synod of Rome, saith, it is clear by the determination of the fathers, that the two natures of Christ remain unconfounded in the union, and undivided, as also his two wills, and the two distinct actions and natural properties of them. Maximus in his disputation with Pyrrhus, found in the second Tome of the councils¹, cleareth one sentence of Honorius, wherein he seemeth to acknowledge but one will in Christ; affirming, out of the testimony of him that wrote that epistle for Honorius, that he meant it of one will of the human nature of Christ; thereby showing that there was no such contrariety of desires found in him as in us. But what is that to the other things that are objected to him? Two objections our adversaries have against them who think that Honorius was condemned for heresy. The first is, that the sixth general council could not condemn him, without being contrary to itself, in allowing the epistle of Agatho², wherein he saith that the faith never failed in Peter's chair, and that his predecessors did always confirm their brethren. The second, that some writers speaking of the Monothelites, and naming divers of them, omit him; that Maximus³, in his Dialogue against Pyrrhus, Theophanes Isaurus in his History cited by Onuphrius, and Emanuel Chalica, in his book in the defence of the Latins against the

divinam dico et humanam, in uno eodemque sanctitatis Dei verbo propter nos incarnato, in unitione inconfusam et indivisam tradidisse monstrantur patres, id est, increatam et creatam, quoniam utrumque eandem naturaliter esse, impossibile est.—Martin. i. In Concil. Lateran. Roman. [Labbe, Tom. vii. col. 87.]

¹ “Maximus, ‘At is ad imperatorem Constantium sic de illa epistola, jussu Joannis pontificis, scripsit. Sane quod unam domini nostri voluntatem diximus, non est accipiendum quasi de duabus divinæ et humanæ naturæ dictum voluntatibus, sed humana tantum. Cum enim Sergius scripsisset prædicare quosdam duas esse Christi voluntates contrarias, nos rescripsimus Christum duas voluntates contrarias non habere.’”—Dialog. Maximi cum Pyrrho. [Bin. Concil. Tom. ii. p. 1036.]

² “Non poterat concilium damnare Honorium tanquam hæreticum, nisi pugnaret cum epistola S. Agathonis, immo etiam secum, et plane contradictoria assereret.”—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

[Vid. p. 440. not. 2. supra.]

³ “In primis, S. Maximus qui tempore Honorii vixit, in Dial. contr. Pyrrhum, Theophanes Isaurus in hist. quam citat Onuphrius, et Emanuel Calleca in libro quem scripsit pro Latinis contra Græcos, Honorium semper catholicum fuisse testantur.

“Denique historici Latini fere omnes, ut Beda, Anastasius biblio-

Greeks, affirm he was ever a catholic; and some other, as Beda, Anastasius bibliothecarius, Blondus, Naclerus, Sabellicus, and Platina, do speak of him as of a catholic bishop. The first of these objections I have answered elsewhere¹, showing that some of Agatho's predecessors might for some short space fail to do their duty, in confirming their brethren, and swerve from the truth; and yet that be true he saith in that epistle, that in the see itself the faith never failed: and that his predecessors fell not either so many, or in such sort, but that the bishops of that Church did ever reach forth their helping hands to other, either in the beginning of each heresy, or before it was utterly extinct and suppressed; as it fell out in this, both in respect of pope Martin and others before, and of himself now. To the second we say, that it doth not seem to be strongly proved that Honorius was no heretic, by the silence of some few. That Maximus doth not clear Honorius generally, but one sentence of Honorius only. That Theophanes Isaurus doth not go about to clear Honorius from heresy, but saith only that the canons of the sixth council were not made by the same fathers that were at first assembled, but by others. So speaking nothing of Honorius, who was condemned in the council, and not in the canons; and that the rest, to wit, Chalica, and some few other living long after the time of Honorius, are no sufficient proof against that cloud of witnesses which we produced in the beginning. And therefore there is yet nothing brought to reprove the testimony of our witnesses, or to make good that he was always a catholic; which is the thing to be proved.

With Honorius we may join Gregory the Third², who, in his epistle to Bonifacius, giveth leave to a man, whose wife falleth into some such infirmity as maketh her unfit to com-

thecharius, Blondus, lib. ix. Decad. 1, Naclerus, Sabellicus, Platina, et alii Honorium catholicum et sanctum pontificem faciunt."—Bellarm. Ibid.

¹ Chap. xlii. [p. 441.]

² "Quod proposuisti, si mulier infirmitate correpta non valuerit debitum viro reddere, quid ejus faciat jugalis? bonum esset si sic permaneret, ut abstinentiæ vacaret: sed quia hoc magnorum est, ille qui se non poterit continere nubat magis. Non tamen subsidii opem subtrahat ab illa quam infirmitas præpedit, non detestabilis culpa excludit."—Gratian. Decret. Part. ii. Caus. 32. Quæst. 7. Canon 'Quod proposuisti.' [Can. 18. col. 1787. Par. 1612.]

pany with him, to marry another; so that he give her maintenance. And that he speaketh not of any impediment before marriage not known, which maketh the contract void from the beginning, but of such infirmities as fall out afterwards, it is evident. First, in that he saith, "If any man's wife shall be taken with such infirmity, &c." Secondly, in that he provideth, "That the husband shall provide for her maintenance;" which in case of a void contract from the beginning is no way reasonable. Thirdly, in that he saith, "He shall thus provide for her, seeing infirmity, and not wickedness, driveth him from her." Fourthly, in that he saith, "It were better he should contain;" seeing in case of abuse by unknown defect and impediment, making the contract void from the beginning, there is no more cause why a man so abused should contain and refrain from marriage, than any other. Now to permit marriage by reason of any defect or infirmity ensuing after the first marriage, I think our adversaries will not deny to be erroneous, seeing the contrary is defined in the council of Trent¹. Neither doth it excuse this error of Gregory, that Bellarmine allegeth out of Austin², who maketh some doubt whether the wife with her husband's consent, yielding to the wicked desires of him in whose hands he is, to save his life, be excusable from sin; seeing he doth but upon a particular accident propose a disputable question: and the other resolveth and giveth warrant for the practice of an unlawful thing, and that as a pope in his directions to Bonifacius, having newly converted certain barbarous people to the faith of Christ.

Wherefore let us proceed to see whether there be any more popes that may justly be charged with error or heresy. We read in the stories of the Church³, that one Formosus,

¹ "Si quis dixerit propter hæresim aut molestam cohabitationem aut affectatam absentiam a conjuge dissolvi posse matrimonii vinculum, anathema sit."—Concil. Trident. Session. xxiv. [Can. 5. Labbe, Tom. xx. col. 150.]

² "Quamquam nonnullæ causæ possint existere, ubi et uxor, mariti consensu, pro ipso marito hoc facere debere videatur," &c.—August. De Serm. Dom. in Mont. Lib. i. [cap. 16. Tom. iii. Part. 2. col. 186.]

³ "Formosus, Portuensis episcopus, Romanæ ecclesiæ 101 præsidet, contra voluntatem quorundam Romanorum, qui Sergium diaconum Romanæ ecclesiæ facere voluerant, sed non prævaluerant. Hic Formosus, cum aliquando in sinistram suspicionem venisset Joanni 8,

bishop of Portua, being hardly thought of, and suspected by John the pope, left his bishoprick, and fled for fear of him; that being called back by John, and refusing to return,

papæ, timore ejus fugiens episcopatum Portuensem reliquit, et quia revocatus a papa redire noluit, anathematizatus est, et tandem ad satisfaciendum papæ in Gallias veniens usque ad laicalem habitum degradatus est, jurans se non amplius Romam intraturum nec episcopatum suæ urbis repetiturum, confirmans etiam propriæ manus scripto se in laici communione perseveraturum. Post a Martino [al. Marino,] successore Joannis in episcopatu contra datum sacramentum restitutus, non solum Romam intravit, sed etiam Romanæ ecclesiæ papatum suscepit; propter quod cum multo scandalo multa per multos annos quæstio et controversia agitata est in ecclesia, aliis ejus et ab eo ordinatorum consecrationem irritam esse debere præjudicantibus, aliis e contra qualiscunque fuerit Formosus, tamen propter sacerdotalis officii dignitatem et fidem eorum qui ordinati fuerant, omnes consecrationes ejus ratas esse debere saniori consilio judicantibus, præsertim cum ipse Formosus a Martino papa absolutus fuerit a perjurio.

“Stephanus Romanæ ecclesiæ 113 præsidet, mensibus quatuor. Hic primum a Formoso papa episcopus Anagninæ ecclesiæ ordinatus ipsum Formosum persequitur, et ordinationes ejus omnes irritas esse debere decernit, et alia horribilia in eum fecit. Legitur enim, quia ipse et non Sergius, corpus Formosus a sepulcro in consilio protractum, et papali veste exutum laicali induit, et abscissis duobus digitis dexteræ manus ejus in Tiberim præcipitari fecit.

“Romanus Romanæ ecclesiæ 114 præsidet.

“903 Theodorus Romanæ ecclesiæ præsidet. Hic contra Stephanum papam sentiens reconciliavit ordinatos a Formoso quos Stephanus per vim Romæ intus et non foris exordinaverat, nec tamen præsumpserat eos iterum consecrare. His reconciliatis, Theodorus papa libros abrenuntiationis reddidit, et igni cremari præcepit. Joannes Romanæ ecclesiæ 116 præsidet. Hic etiam ad confirmandum Formosi ordinationem, quam Stephanus deposuerat, synodum 74 episcoporum præsentibus Francorum archiepiscopis et rege apud Ravennam statuit, et coram eis combusta est synodus quam Stephanus in damnationem Formosi fecerat.

“Benedictus ecclesiæ Romanæ 117 præsidet.

“Sergius Romanæ ecclesiæ 120 præsidet. Iste est Sergius diaconus propter Formosum a papatu reprobatus, qui Romanos minis et terroribus perpulit ut omnes ordinationes Formosi irritas haberent, et in ultionem suæ repulsæ (quod dictu nefas est) Formosum sepulchro extractum in sede pontificatus sacerdotaliter indutum decollari præcepit. Et insuper tribus digitis abscissis in Tiberim jactari fecit, et omnes quos ille ordinaverat, injuste exordinavit, et injustius reordinavit.”—Sigebert. Chron. Ann. 900, et seq. [In Rer. Germ. Script. Pistorii. Tom. I. pp. 804, 6.]

he was anathematized by him; and that at last coming into France to satisfy the pope, he was degraded, and put into a lay habit, and made to swear never to enter into Rome any more, nor ever to communicate but as a layman: yet afterwards by Martinus, John's successor, he was restored to his bishopric, absolved from his oath, came to Rome, and in the end obtained to be pope, contrary to the minds of many of the Romans, who desired rather to have had one Sergius, a deacon of the Church of Rome, but prevailed not. Whereupon there grew great question with much scandal, some affirming that his consecration, and the consecration of such as he ordained, was void; others, that whatsoever were thought of Formosus, yet for the dignity of his bishoply office, and the faith of those he ordained, their ordinations were to be holden for good, especially seeing he was absolved from his perjury by Martinus the pope. The next pope (save one) that succeeded Formosus was Stephen, who sat but four months, yet was not idle; but though he had been ordained bishop of Anagnia by him, persecuted him with deadly hate, and pronounced the ordinations of all such as he had ordained to be void. After him succeeded Romanus, and after Romanus, Theodorus, who, being contrarily minded to Stephen, reconciled those whom Stephen had degraded, but presumed not to consecrate or ordain them again. After Theodorus followed John, who, to confirm the ordinations of Formosus, pronounced void by Stephen, called a council of seventy-two bishops, the archbishops of France and the king being present; and, in the sight of them all, caused the acts of the synod which Stephen held for condemnation of Formosus to be burned. After John succeeded Benedictus, and after him Sergius the deacon, that missed the popedom when Formosus got it. This Sergius, in revenge of his former repulse, forced the Romans with threats and terrors to account the ordinations of Formosus void, and (which is not to be spoken) drew him out of his grave after he had rested in it a good space, put upon him the papal vestures, set him in Peter's chair, commanded him to be beheaded, and then cutting off three of his fingers, caused him to be cast into Tiber, degrading all that he had ordained. Here we see popes clearly convinced of heresy, and defining and decreeing for heresy. For seeing Formosus was sometime undoubtedly a true bishop, it was an error in

faith to say, that his ordinations were void. This is so clear, that Bellarmine denieth it not, but saith only, that neither Stephen nor Sergius published any decree that their ordinations were void whom Formosus had ordained, and that they were to be re-ordained: but did only so re-ordain *de facto*, in their fury and distempered passions: wherein he is clearly refuted by Sigebert, who saith expressly that they decreed *omnes ordinationes ejus irrita esse debere*: that is, "That all his ordinations were to be taken and reputed for void."

To Stephen and Sergius we may add Cœlestinus the Third¹, who (as Alphonsus a Castro truly affirmeth) cannot by any means be excused from heresy, in that he taught that the bond of marriage is so dissolved by heresy, that he whose wife falleth into heresy may lawfully leave her and take another. This decree of Cœlestinus is not now to be found in the Decretals, but it was in the ancient; and Alphonsus professeth he read it there himself. Now that it is heretical in the judgment of our adversaries, it is evident, in that Innocentius the Third teacheth the contrary, and the Council of Trent defineth otherwise. Neither doth Bellarmine's answer, that he did not pass any decree, but only deliver his own private opinion, help the matter. For Gratian² maketh the Decretals equal in authority with the canons of councils, and our adver-

¹ "Trigesimus tertius est Cœlestinus III. quem Alphonsus de Castro Lib. i. de Hæres. cap. 4 affirmat non posse ullo modo excusari ab hæresi, quod docuerit per hæresim ita matrimonium solvi ut liceat ei conjugium aliud inire, cujus conjux in hæresim lapsus sit: tam etsi enim nunc hoc decretum Cœlestini non exstat, tamen fuit olim in antiquis decretalibus cap. 'Laudabilem,' de Convers. Infid. quod decretum Alphonsus vidisse se dicit. Esse autem hanc Cœlestini sententiam hæreticam planum est, tum quia contrarium docuit Innocentius III. cap. 'Quanto,' de Divort. tum etiam quia idem definitum est in concilio Tridentino sess. 24, can. 5 'Respondeo;' nec Cœlestinum nec Innocentium aliquid de ea re certi statuisset, sed utrumque respondisse quod sibi probabilius videbatur. Constat multa esse in epistolis decretalibus quæ non faciunt rem aliquam esse de fide, sed solum opiniones pontificum de ea re nobis declarant."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. iv. cap. 14. Tom. i. p. 415.]

² "Manifeste error Gratiani deprehenditur, qui dicit, 'Decretales itaque epistolæ canonibus conciliorum pari jure exæquantur.'"—Alphons. a Castro, De Hæres. Lib. i. cap. 2. [col. 12. Par. 1571.]

Gratian. Part. i. Dist. xx. in Exord. [col. 93. Par. 1612.]

saries are wont to prove the pope's power by his Decretals, as if all they were subject to him, and bound to obey him, to whom he writeth.

The next pope that is charged with heresy is Nicholas the Fourth¹, who defineth that Christ taught both by word and example most perfect poverty, consisting in the abandoning of all propriety in things, and right or claim to them, either in particular, or in respect of the whole college and company of men living together; and that such poverty is pleasing to God, and meritorious. For the better understanding of this matter, we must distinguish the use of things, and the propriety in them, or right and claim to them. The propriety in things, and the right and claim to them, is two-fold²; either absolute, when men may judicially challenge a thing as their own, and

¹ "Trigesimus quartus est Nicolaus IV. qui in cap. 'Exiit,' de Verb. Signif. in Sexto, definit, Christum verbo et exemplo docuisse, perfectam paupertatem, quæ consistit in abdicatione omnium rerum, nullo sibi dominio relicto, nec in particulari, nec in communi; ac proinde talem paupertatem esse sanctam et meritoriam."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "Aliter accipitur humanum dominium magis stricte, ut isti impugnatores affirmant, et dominium strictissime sumptum tali modo diffiniunt. Dominium est potestas humana principalis rem temporalem in judicio vendicandi, et omni modo qui non est a jure naturali prohibitus pertractandi. Et per istam ultimam particulam excluditur jus quod clerici in rebus temporalibus noscuntur habere: quia licet habeant potestatem principalem vendicandi, &c. non tamen possunt res ecclesiasticas ad suam libitum pertractare. Multis que possunt laici de suis temporalibus ordinare, qui clericis sunt penitus interdicti.

"De usu facti dicunt, quod usus facti est actus utendi re aliqua exteriori, sicut inhabitare, comedere, bibere, equitare, vestem induere....

"De usu vero juris dicunt, quod usus juris est quoddam jus positivum determinatum institutum ex ordinatione humana, qua quis habet licitam potestatem et auctoritatem utendi rebus alienis, salva rerum substantia. Usus autem sic dictus dividi potest in nudum usum et in usum fructum. Nudus usus est, cum quis habet jus utendi re aliena, salva rerum substantia. Sed hoc jus non potest alteri vendere, nec locare, nec gratis concedere. Usus fructus est pinguius jus in rebus alienis, salva rerum substantia, quia qui usum fructum habet non solum ipsa re uti potest, sed omne jus suum potest alteri vendere, concedere, et locare."—Ockam. Opus 90 dierum. cap. 2. [Apud Goldast. Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp. Tom. II. pp. 996, 1000.]

use it how and in what sort they will, so that it be not prohibited by the law of God and nature; or restrained and limited, as clergymen may challenge the possessions and lands belonging to them, and judicially recover them if they be withholden from them; yet may they not so freely dispose of them as laymen may of theirs. The use of things is two-fold: for there is *usus juris*, and *usus facti*. *Usus facti* is when one hath the use of a thing, but so that he hath no right to use it warrantable by any positive or human law; and if any one will deprive him of it, he cannot by law hinder him. *Usus juris* is the right one hath to use a thing, leaving the claim of the possession of the substance of it to the owner thereof. This kind of use is likewise twofold, *nudus* and *usus-fructus*. The former is when one hath right to use a thing, but so limited and restrained, that he may neither sell, let, nor give the same right; the later, when he may. The Franciscan friars imagining the height of Christian perfection to consist in extreme poverty, by their vow of poverty abandon, not only in particular, as do other Religious, but in general, even in respect of their whole company and society, all interest, right and claim to lands, livings and possessions, or to the use of any such things: leaving nothing to themselves but the bare use of such things as by free gift, begging, or labour, come to their hands; without all right to use them pleadable and justifiable by any course of human law. So that if any one will take the bread out of their hands before it come to their mouths, or the clothes from them wherewith they hide their nakedness, they may not complain of him for so doing, nor prosecute any suit against him for it. This kind of poverty pope Nicholas affirmeth Christ taught, both by word and example, and willeth the Franciscans according to their rule strictly to observe the same. And for their safety and security taketh order, that all moveables given to them for use shall in respect of right belong to the Church of Rome, as likewise their oratories and cemeteries; but their dwellings not so, unless the giver express an absolute gift (which yet must not be to the friars, but to the Church), and the Church expressly accept the same; for otherwise the owner may at his pleasure take them away again. Farther he ordereth, that such things as are given to them, and they have the use of, they may either of themselves change them for such other things as they need or de-

sire, or cause the governor and disposer of them appointed by the pope to sell them, and with the money to buy such things as they need, and let them have the use of them, as books and the like: for with money they themselves may not meddle. Pope John the Two-and-twentieth, following Nicholas, and finding by experience that these friars did but abuse the world with their fair shows of perfection¹, condemned their hypocrisy, and would be no patron of it, as his predecessor was. First, therefore, he showed that perfection consisteth essentially in charity, which Paul nameth the bond of perfection, and that the abandoning of propriety in things maketh nothing to perfection, farther than it excludeth the care that is wont to be found in men, in getting, keeping, and disposing of them, weakening the act of divine love. So that if there be as much carefulness in men after the disclaiming of propriety in things as before, their seeming poverty maketh nothing to Christian perfection. Now he saith, that after the ordination of his predecessor, these friars were no less careful in getting and keeping things, both by begging, judicial suing, and the like means, than any other mendicants that have some things as their own in common. And that therefore howsoever they pleased themselves, their observation was of no more perfection than theirs that had something of their own in common. Secondly, he showed that these mendicants having the use of such things as are given to them, and the Church of Rome the propriety (in name and title, but not in deed, being only to secure them in the use thereof, and to make no benefit), that it is but a single right the Church hath, and that they are in truth and in deed no poorer than they that have things of their own; seeing they may change the use of one thing for another, or at least cause the procurator, designed by the Church of Rome, to change things into money, and buy for them such as they rather desire to have; making use of all things that come to their hands at their pleasure, as much as they that have them of their own. Thirdly, he pronounced, that to think that Christ and his apostles had nothing of their own in special or common, and that they had no right to use such things as they had, to sell them, give them, or with them to buy other, is contrary to the gospel, condemneth Christ and his apostles

¹ In Extravagant. 'Ad Conditorem Canonum.' [Tit. De Verborum Significatione, col. 125. Lugd. 1624.]

of injustice, and overthroweth the whole scripture. Yet pope Nicholas defined, that Christ and his apostles had nothing of their own, either in special or common, and that the having of a common bag no way contrarieth this conceit, seeing that was but by a kind of dispensation in the person of the weak and imperfect, and to show that he disliketh not them that come short of his perfection. Thus we see pope Nicholas erred in a matter of faith, patronized hypocrites in their feigned shows of counterfeit perfection, and was disliked and contraried by his own successor, John the Two-and-twentieth, for the same ; by reason whereof there grew a main difference between pope John and the Franciscan friars, he charging them with heresy, and persecuting them from place to place, and they likewise disclaiming him as a damnable heretic, and no pope. The principal men on the friars' part were Michael Cæsenas¹, and Occam² the great schoolman, who hath written much against pope John touching this argument.

Neither is pope John (though in this point of Christian perfection he were of a sounder and better judgment than his predecessor) any happier than he. For he is likewise charged with error in matter of faith (and that not unjustly), by the same friars, that he so much hated and persecuted. For, as Occam testifieth in his Dialogues³, he taught that the souls of the just shall not see God till the general resurrection, and that not faintly, or doubtingly, but in such passionate and violent manner, as not to endure those that thought otherwise. Gerson⁴ likewise in his sermon upon Easter-day, before the French king and his nobles, saith : “ That the thief on the cross in that very hour that Christ spake unto him was made happy, and saw God face to face, according to the promise of Christ made unto him, ‘ This day shalt thou be with me in paradise ;’ and that thereby the doctrine of John the Two-and-twentieth is proved false, that was condemned by the divines of Paris with the sound of trumpets, before king Philip, uncle to the king before whom then he spake ; the king rather believing the

¹ Vid. Literas Michael. Cæsen. in fine Dialog. Occami.

² Occam. in Opere 90. Dierum et alibi.

³ 2 Partis Tract. i. in Initio. [Apud Goldast.]

⁴ Part. iv. Operum Ejus. [Tom. iii. col. 1205. Antv. 1706.]
With Gerson agreeth Adrian. VI. in Quæst. [in 4 sent.] De Confirmat. circa finem. [cap. ‘Ad secundum.’ f. 55 a, 8vo. Lugd. 1546.]

divines of Paris, than the court of Rome." Bellarmine¹, to derive the hate of this matter from the pope to others, would willingly fasten this error on Calvin, and to that purpose allegeth² two places out of him. But neither of them proveth any such thing. For in the first, he speaketh not of any stay of the saints departed without, in outward courts, out of heaven, till the resurrection (as the cardinal strangely misunderstandeth him), but showeth, by a most apt comparison, that as in the time of Moses' law the high priest only entered into the holiest of all to make an atonement, and all the people stayed without; so none but Christ goeth into the presence of God to make peace, and to work the great work of reconciliation, and that all the sons of men are to expect without, till he bring them assurance of favour and acceptance. And in the second place where he saith, that the dead are joined with us that live in the unity of the same faith, his meaning is not that faith opposite to sight is found in the saints after death, as it is in us, but that they have a clear view, and present enjoying of those things which we believe. Neither is there anything found in Calvin that may any way excuse the error of pope John. Thus then, I hope, it doth appear by that which hath been said, that popes are subject to error, that they may become heretics, and define for heresy, and that therefore the second supposed privilege of the Roman bishop, which is infallibility of judgment, is found to have no proof at all. Wherefore let us proceed to the third, which is his power to dispose of the kingdoms of the world, and to overrule the princes and potentates thereof.

CHAPTER XLIV.

OF THE POPE'S UNJUST CLAIM OF TEMPORAL DOMINION OVER
THE WHOLE WORLD.

TOUCHING the right and interest of popes in intermeddling with secular affairs, and disposing of the kingdoms of the world, there are three opinions among the Romanists.

¹ De Pontif. Lib. iv. cap. 14. [p. 416.]

² Instit. Lib. iii. cap. 20. [§ 23. p. 233.] et § 24. [p. 234.]

The first is¹, that the pope is sovereign lord of all the world, or at least of all the Christian world; and that the princes of the earth are but his vicegerents and lieutenants. The second², that the pope is not sovereign lord of the world, nor of any part thereof; and that therefore he may not at his pleasure intermeddle with the affairs of princes, but only in case of some defect found in them, as when they fail to do their duty, or seek to hinder the common good, especially of the Church. The third³, that he may not at all intermeddle with the disposition of earthly kingdoms, or restrain or depose princes, how much soever they abuse their authority.

The first of these three opinions had anciently, and hath presently, great patrons and followers. Yet Bellarmine⁴ very confidently and learnedly refuteth the same. First, showing that the pope is not sovereign lord of the whole world. Secondly, that he is not lord of the Christian world. And thirdly, that he is lord of no part of the world. That he is

¹ "Prima sententia est summum pontificem jure divino habere plenissimam potestatem in universum orbem terrarum, tum in rebus ecclesiasticis tum in politicis. Ita docent Augustinus Triumphus in Summa de Pot. Eccles. Quæst. I. Art. I, Alvarus Pelagius, Lib. I. de Planctu Ecclesiæ, cap. 13, &c.

"Altera non tam sententia quam hæresis in altero extremo posita duo docet. Primo pontificem ut pontificem et ex jure divino nullam habere temporalem potestatem, nec posse ullo modo imperare principibus secularibus, nedum eos regnis et principatu privare, etiamsi illi privari alioqui mereantur. Secundo docet non licuisse pontifici aliisque episcopis accipere temporale dominium quod nunc habent in quasdam urbes et provincias, sive ejusmodi dominium donatum eis fuerit sive illud usurpaverint, prohibet enim jus divinum uni homini gladium spiritualem et temporalem simul committi.

"Tertia sententia media et catholicorum theologorum communis, pontificem ut pontificem non habere directe et immediate ullam temporalem potestatem, sed solum spiritualem; tamen ratione spiritualis habere saltem indirecte potestatem quandam eamque summam in temporalibus."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 1. [p. 433.]

² Bellarm. et alii.

³ Waldensis, Gerson, Hart, and many other cited in the examination of Blackwell. ['A large examination of M. George Blackwel,' &c. p. 36. 4to. Lond. 1607.]

⁴ "Quod ad primum attinet, tria ordine probabimus. Primo, papam non esse dominum totius orbis. Secundo non esse dominum totius orbis Christiani. Tertio, non esse dominum ullius provinciæ, aut oppidi, nullamque habere jure divino jurisdictionem mere temporalem."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

not lord of the whole world, he proveth, because not of those provinces that are possessed by infidels, which he demonstrateth. First, because Christ committed none but only his sheep to Peter, and therefore gave him no authority over infidels, which are not his sheep; whereunto Saint Paul agreeth, professing that “he hath nothing to do to judge them that are without¹.” Secondly, because dominion and the right of princes is not founded in grace or faith, but in freewill and reason, and hath not sprung from the written law of Moses, or Christ, but from the law of nations and nature. Which is most clear in that God both in the old and new Testament approveth the kingdoms of the Gentiles and infidels, as appeareth by that of Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar: “O king, thou art king of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory: and in all places where the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee a ruler over them all².” And that of Christ: “Give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s³.” With whom the apostle agreeth, requiring the Christians of his time not only to pay tribute to heathen kings, but also “to obey them for conscience’ sake⁴;” which men were not bound to, if they had no authority and right to command. Neither can it be said that heathen princes are the pope’s lieutenants, and therefore to be obeyed for his sake, though not for their own; seeing the pope would have no such lieutenant, if it lay in him to place them or displace them. Lastly, he proveth that the pope hath no such sovereign right of commanding over all, as is pretended, seeing it had been vain for Christ to give him a right to that whereof he should never get the possession. And having thus proved that infidels were truly and rightly lords of the countries subject to them before the coming of Christ, that he found no nullity in their titles, nor ever seized their kingdoms and dominions into his own hands, as some fondly imagine that he did, he proceedeth to prove, that princes, when they become Christians, lose not the right that they formerly had to their kingdoms, but get a new right to the kingdom of heaven. For that otherwise Christ’s grace should destroy nature, and his benefits be prejudicial to such

¹ 1 Cor. v. 12.² Dan. ii. 37.³ Matth. xxii. 21.⁴ Rom. xiii. 5.

as are made partakers of them. Whereas Christ came not to destroy and overthrow things well settled before, but to perfect them; not to hurt any, but to do good to all. For confirmation whereof he allegeth part of the hymn of Sedulius, which the whole Church doth sing,

Hostis Herodes impie

Christum venire quid times?

Non eripit mortalia,

Qui regna dat cœlestia:

that is, "O impious enemy Herod, why dost thou fear Christ's coming? He will not deprive thee of thy transitory kingdom upon earth, that gives an eternal kingdom in heaven." Whence it followeth, that Christ imposed no such hard condition on those kings that were to become Christians, as to leave their crowns and dignities.

And so he cometh to his second proposition, that the pope is not temporal lord of the Christian world, which he confirmeth: first, because if the pope were sovereign lord of all the Christian world, bishops should be temporal lords of their cities, and the places adjoining subject to them; which neither they will grant that contend for the sovereignty of the pope, nor can stand with that of Saint Ambrose¹, who saith, "If the emperor ask tribute, we deny it him not. The church-lands do pay tribute." And again, "Tribute is Cæsar's; it is not denied him; but the Church is God's, and may not be yielded to Cæsar." And that of Hosius bishop of Corduba, who (as we read in Athanasius²) telleth the emperor, that God hath given him the empire, but that he hath committed to bishops those things that pertain to the Church. Secondly, out of the confession of popes, pope Leo³ confessing, that Martianus the emperor was ap-

¹ "Si tributum petit imperator, non negamus, agri ecclesiæ solvunt tributum."—Ambros. Orat. de Tradend. Basil. [Tom. II. col. 872. E.]

"Tributum Cæsaris est: non negatur. Ecclesia Dei est, Cæsari utique non debet addici."—[Ibid. col. 873. D.]

² "Σοὶ βασιλείαν ὁ Θεὸς ἐνεχείρισεν, ἡμῖν τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπίστευσεν."—In Epist. ad Solitariam Vitam Agentes. [Al. Hist. Arian. ad Monachos. Tom. I. p. 371.]

³ "Illum retributorem in omnibus habeatis, . . . qui vos ad hoc ut fides catholica ab insidiis inimicorum suorum defenderetur, elegit."—Leo, Epist. ad Marcian. xxxviii. [Al. lxxviii. Tom. I. col. 1034.]

"Per Dominum Jesum Christum, qui regni vestri est auctor et rector."—Id. Epist. xliii. [Al. xc. col. 1064.]

pointed to the empire by God, and that God was the author of his empire: and Gelasius¹ writing to Anastasius the emperor, and acknowledging that there are two things by which principally the world is guided, to wit, the sacred authority of bishops, and the regal power of princes; with whom Gregory agreeth when he saith, "Power over all is given from heaven to the piety of my Lord²."

And from hence he inferreth his third proposition³, that the pope is temporal lord of no part of the world, in the right of Peter's successor, and Christ's vicar. For, if there were no nullity in the titles of infidel kings and princes, nor no necessity implied, in their conversion, of relinquishing their right when they became Christians, but that both infidels and Christians, notwithstanding any act of Christ, continued in the full possession of princely power and right, it could not be, that Christ should invest Peter or his successors with any kingly authority, seeing he could give them none but such as he should take from others.

Nay, he proceedeth farther, and sheweth⁴, that Christ himself, while he was on the earth, was no temporal lord or king, and therefore much less gave any temporal dominion or kingdom to his apostles. That he was no temporal king, he proveth, because the right to be a king or lord in such sort as men are kings or lords, is either by inheritance, election, conquest, or special donation and gift of Almighty God. Now that Christ according to the flesh was a king by right of inheritance, he saith, it cannot be proved, because though

¹ "Duo sunt, Imperator Auguste, quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur, auctoritas sacra pontificum et regalis potestas."—Ep. ad Anastas. quæ habetur Dist. 96. cap. 'Duo sunt.' [Gratian. Decret. Part. i. col. 509. Par. 1612.]

² "Potestas super omnes homines dominorum meorum pietati coelitus data est."—Greg. Lib. ii. Epist. lxii. ad Mauritium. [Al. Lib. iii. Epist. lxxv. Tom. ii. col. 676.]

³ "Superest nunc ut demonstremus papam directe nullius loci esse dominum temporalem jure divino."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

⁴ "Id vero hac ratione manifeste probatur. Christus, ut homo, dum in terris vixit, non accepit nec voluit ullius provinciæ vel oppidi mere temporale dominium: summus autem pontifex Christi vicarius est, et Christum nobis repræsentat, qualis erat dum hic inter homines viveret; igitur summus pontifex, ut Christi vicarius atque adeo ut summus pontifex est, nullius provinciæ vel oppidi habet mere temporale dominium."—[Ibid.]

he came of the kingly family, yet it is uncertain whether he were the next in blood to David or not. And besides, the kingdom was taken away from David's house before Christ was born, and God had foretold, that of the house of Jecooniah, of which Christ came (as we may read in the first¹ of Saint Matthew), there should never be any temporal king such as David, and the rest that succeeded him, were, saying; "Write this man barren, a man that shall not prosper in his days; for there shall be no man of his seed to sit upon the throne of David, and to have power any more in Judah²." And whereas it might be objected, that the angel prophesied that "the Lord God should give unto Christ the seat of David his father³," the cardinal answereth out of Hierome, upon the place of Hieremy; and Ambrose upon Luke, that the words of Almighty God which we read in Hieremy are to be understood of a temporal kingdom, and the words of the angel, of a spiritual and eternal kingdom. That Christ was not a temporal king by right of election, he proveth by that of Christ himself, when he saith, "O man, who hath made me a judge or a divider among you⁴?" and by that of St John where he saith, that "When Christ knew they meant to come and take him, and make him a king, he fled again himself alone into a mountain⁵." So that he neither was chosen, nor would have accepted of any such choice. That by right of conquest and victory he was not a temporal king, it appeareth, in that his war was not with mortal kings, to deprive them of their kingdoms, but with the prince of darkness; according to that of the apostle: "To this purpose did the Son of God appear, that he might dissolve the works of the devil⁶." And that again, "Now is the prince of this world cast out⁷." And that of Saint Paul, who speaking of Christ, saith, "That spoiling principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in himself⁸." So that his warfare was not, by carnal weapons to get himself an earthly kingdom, but by spiritual weapons, mighty through God, to get a spiritual kingdom, that he might reign in the hearts of men, by faith and grace, where

¹ Ver. 12.³ Luke i. 32.⁵ John vi. 15.⁷ John xii. 31.² Jerem. xxii. 30.⁴ Luke xii. 14.⁶ 1 John iii. 8.⁸ Coloss. ii. 15.

Satan reigned before by infidelity, disobedience, and sin. Lastly, that he was no temporal king by any special gift of God his Father, it is evident out of his own words, when he saith, "My kingdom is not hence¹." For as the fathers² note upon these words, Christ meant by so saying, to put Pilate out of doubt, that he affected no temporal kingdom. And therefore the sense of his words must needs be this, "I am a king, but not in such sort as Cæsar and Herod:" "My kingdom is not of this world," that is, the supports of it are not things of this world; it doth not consist in honour, riches, and power of this world. This thing the cardinal³ farther proveth to be true, because he came to minister, and not to be ministered unto; to be judged, and not to judge; and by his whole course of conversation showed the same, never taking upon him to do any kingly act. For whereas he cast out the buyers and sellers out of the temple, it rather

¹ John xviii. 36.

² "Ὁ ἐδεδοίκει τέως ὁ Πιλάτος διέλυσεν, τὴν τῆς τυραννίδος ὑποψίαν."—Chrysost. [In Joann. Hom. lxxxiii. Tom. viii. p. 495.]

"Διαλύει τὴν ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ὑποψίαν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία ἢ ἐμὴ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· ὥστε μὴ δέδειθί με ὡς τύραννον καὶ στασιάστην."—Theophylact. [In Joann. cap. 18. Tom. i. p. 743. Ven. 1754.]

"Ἐλυσε τῷ Πιλάτῳ τὸν φόβον, ἅτε δὴ τῆς τοῦ Καίσαρος βασιλείας κεχειροτημένῳ φύλακι. Ὡς το μὲν γὰρ νόμῳ δὴ πάντως τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς μελετᾶσθαι παρὰ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἀνταρσιν, πεφλυαρηκότων καὶ τοῦτο τῶν Ἰουδαίων."—Cyril. Alex. In Joann. [Lib. xii. Tom. iv. p. 1038. Par. 1638.]

"Nolite metuere metu vanissimo, quo Herodes ille major cum Christus natus nuntiaretur, expavit et tot infantes ut ad eum mors perveniret occidit, timendo magis quam irascendo crudelior."—August. [In Joann. Tract. cv. Tom. iii. Part. ii. col. 791.]

"Qui dicit non esse de hoc mundo regnum suum ostendit esse supra mundum. Ita et erat regnum ejus et non erat: non erat in sæculo, erat supra sæculum."—Ambros. In Luc. Lib. iii. prope finem. [Tom. i. col. 1330.]

³ "Christus nunquam exercuit in hoc mundo regiam potestatem: venit enim ministrare non ministrari; et judicari, non judicare: ergo frustra accepisset regiam auctoritatem, frustra enim est potentia quæ nunquam redigitur in actum.

"Respondent, Christum exercuisse hanc potestatem quando ejecit de templo ementes et boves. At in primis ejicere de templo alicujus non est regis officium sed sacerdotum.

"Sed præterea sciendum Christum non ejecisse illos homines de templo quasi pontificia, vel regia potestate, sed more prophetarum zelo quodam divino."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

pertained to the priest's office than the king's, according to that which we read in the old Testament, that the priest¹ drove the king himself out of the temple, when disorderly he presumed to do things not pertaining to him: and yet he did it not by any priestly or kingly authority, but after the manner of prophets, by a kind of divine zeal, like that wherewith Phinehees² was moved to kill the adulterer and adulteress, and Elias³ to slay the prophets of Baal. This most true opinion of the cardinal, that Christ was no temporal king, is farther confirmed, in that such a kind of kingdom had not been necessary. Nay, it had been an hinderance to the work he had in hand, which was to persuade to the contempt of glory, honour, riches, pleasures, and all such other earthly things, wherewith the kings of the earth abound; and by suffering death, to overcome him that had the power of death, and to reconcile the world unto God. And besides, in that all the places where any mention is made of the kingdom of Christ are necessarily understood of a spiritual and eternal kingdom. So in the Psalm, "I am appointed of him a king, to preach his commandments⁴." And again, in the book of Daniel: "In their days shall God raise up a kingdom, which shall not be destroyed for ever. And of his kingdom there shall be no end⁵." Whereas the kingdoms of men continue but for a time; and therefore if Christ had been a king in such sort while he was upon the earth as men are, he had ceased to be so when he left the earth. And then it could not have been true, that of his kingdom there should be none end. Nay, seeing the kingdom of the Jews was possessed by the Romans, at or immediately after the time of the departure of Christ out of the world, and afterwards by the Saracens, and Turks; how could that of Daniel have been fulfilled, that his kingdom shall not be given to another people, if his kingdom had been like the kingdoms of men? So it is true, that Christ came into the world to be a king, and that God gave him the seat of David his father. But this kingdom was divine, spiritual, eternal, and proper unto him, in that he was the Son of God, and in that he was God and man. But a

¹ 2 Chron. xxvi. 20.

² Numb. xxv. 7.

³ 1 Kings xviii. 40.

⁴ Psal. ii. 7.

⁵ Dan. ii. 44.

temporal kingdom, such as the sons of men have, he had not. And hereupon Saint Augustine bringeth in Christ speaking in this sort¹, *Audite Judæi et Gentes, audi circumcisio, audi præputium, audite omnia regna terrena, non impedio dominationem vestram in hoc mundo, &c.*: that is, "Hear, O Jews and Gentiles, hear, circumcision and uncircumcision, hear, all ye kingdoms of the earth; I hinder not your dominion and rule in this world, because my kingdom is not of this world. Fear not therefore with that most vain and causeless fear, wherewith Herod feared, and slew so many innocent babes, being cruel, rather out of fear than anger, and so forward: showing that the kingdom of Christ is merely spiritual, and such as no way prejudiceth the kingdoms of men." Which the Gloss² confirmeth, noting that Christ, while he was yet to live longer in this world, when the multitudes came to make him a king, refused it; but that when he was ready to suffer he no way reproved, but willingly accepted the hymns of them that received him in triumphant manner, and welcomed him to Jerusalem, honouring him as a king; because he was a king, not having a temporal and earthly kingdom, but an heavenly. Whereunto Leo agreeth, showing that Herod, when he heard a prince was born to the Jews, feared a successor; but that his fear was vain and causeless, saying: *O cæca stultæ æmulationis impietas, quæ perturbandum putas divinum tuo furore consilium! Dominus mundi temporale non quærit regnum qui præstat æternum*³: that is, "O blind impiety of foolish emulation, which thinkest to trouble and hinder the counsels of God by thy fury. The Lord of the world, who giveth an eternal kingdom, came not into the world to seek a temporal kingdom." And Fulgentius⁴ accordeth with him,

¹ August. in Joann. xviii. [Tom. iii. Part. ii. col. 791.]

² "Cum turbæ eum rapere vellent, et facere regem, fugit, et regnum adhuc victurus noluit. Non autem jam passurus regem non refugit se dici. Non hymnos filio Dei et rege dignos non eos reprimit qui regnum David in eo restaurandum, et priscae benedictionis donum concinnunt: quia scilicet non temporalis et terreni, sed æterni in cœlis rex esset imperii."—Gloss. Ord. [In Marc. xi. 10. Tom. v. col. 598. Lugd. 1589.]

³ Leo, Serm. De Epiphania. [Al. Serm. xxxi. Tom. i. col. 113.]

⁴ "In auro simul uterque confunditur [Arianus et Manichæus]:proinde uterque non experietur regem a quo per fidem regatur, sed a quo pro infidelitatis crimine puniatur: quia ab uno divinitatis,

saying: "The gold which the sages offered to Christ showed him to be a king, but not such a king as will have his image and superscription in the coin, but such an one as seeketh his image in the sons of men. Whence it followeth, he was no temporal or mundane king; seeing they have their images and superscriptions in their coin that are kings after the manner of the world." This assertion may be proved by many unanswerable reasons. The first is this, Christ standing before Pilate, and being asked by him if he were a king, answered, "That his kingdom was not of this world¹." Therefore he was no temporal or mundane king. This consequence some deny, affirming that Christ intended not in his answer to Pilate to deny his kingdom to be a temporal, earthly, and mundane kingdom, but that he meant only to let him know that he had received his kingdom of God, and that the world neither gave it him, nor chose him to it. And therefore he said, *Regnum meum non est hinc*, and not, *Regnum meum non est hic*; that is, "My kingdom is not hence," and not, "My kingdom is not here." This was the evasion of pope John the Two-and-twentieth, as Ockam testifieth²; but he refuteth the same by most clear circumstances of scripture, and evidence of reason, showing that Christ being accused unto Pilate as an enemy to Cæsar, in that he made himself a king, so cleared himself, that Pilate pronounced that he found nothing against him; which he could not, nor he would not have done, if he had confessed his kingdom to be a mundane kingdom, though he had derived the right and title of it from heaven. For Cæsar would not have endured any claim of such a kingdom, though fetched from heaven. Neither durst Pilate have pronounced him guiltless that had made such a claim; and therefore Christ, when he said his kingdom was not

ab altero carnis veritas denegatur."—Fulgent. Serm. De Epiph. [p. 255. Ven. 1742.]

¹ Joh. xviii. 36.

² "'Regnum meum non est hinc.' Hoc est, regnum non pertinet ad mundanos. 'Non dixit non est hic.' Verum est, quia regnum suum fuit hic corporaliter, sed mente fuit in cœlo.

"'Quod regnum suum a mundo non habuerit, sed a Deo.' Hoc verum est de regno spirituali non temporalis. 'Jesum fecit Dominus Christum,' id est regem, de rege spiritualiter non temporaliter intellecto, concedi potest."—Ockam. Op. xc. Dierum. cap. 93. [Apud Goldast. Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp. Tom. II. p. 1164.]

of this world, meant not only to deny the receiving of it from the world, but also the dependence of it upon anything in the world; the supports of it not being things earthly, but heavenly and divine; it no way consisting in riches, honour, power, and worldly greatness, as do the kingdoms of men, but in the power of God. Which thing is aptly expressed by Christ himself, when he saith, "If my kingdom were of this world, my soldiers would fight for me¹." The second reason is this: he that is no judge of secular quarrels, nor divider of inheritance, is no king. For these things belong to the office of a king. But Christ was no judge of such quarrels and differences, therefore he was no king. That he was no judge of secular quarrels, nor divider of inheritance, it is evident by his own denial thereof². Which Saint Ambrose excellently expresseth, saying³: *Bene terrena declinat, qui propter divina descenderat; nec iudex dignatur esse litium, et arbiter facultatum, vivorum habens mortuorumque iudicium, et arbitrium meritorum*: that is, "He doth well decline things earthly, who descended and came down for things divine. Neither doth he vouchsafe to be a judge of quarrels, and an arbitrator to determine the differences of men about their possessions, who is appointed to be judge of the quick and dead, and to whom it pertaineth to discern between the well and ill doings of men." And again: *Merito refutatur ille frater, qui dispensatorem caelestium gestiebat terrenis occupare*: that is, "That brother is worthily rejected, and hath the repulse, who sought to busy him whom God hath appointed the disposer of things heavenly, with things that are earthly." The third is, because Christ refused to be a king when it was offered him, and told his disciples, that "The kings of the nations have dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority. But that it should not be so with them; but that whosoever would be great among them must be their minister⁴." The fourth, he that is a king and will never meddle with the things that belong to a king, is justly to be charged either with wickedness or negligence. But Christ never meddled with anything pertaining to the office of a temporal king in this world: therefore either he was no such

¹ Joh. xviii. 36.² Luke xii. 14³ Ambros. in Loc. [Tom. i. col. 1438.]⁴ Matth. xx. 25.

king, or he may be charged with malice or negligence. But neither of these two latter may be admitted; therefore he was no such king. The fifth, there cannot be two kings of one kingdom, unless either they hold the same jointly, or the one acknowledge to hold the same as of and from the other. But Cæsar and Christ neither held the kingdom of Judæa jointly, neither did Cæsar hold it as from Christ, nor Christ as from Cæsar. Therefore either Cæsar was no true king, or Christ was no secular king of that kingdom. But that Cæsar was a true king, it appeareth by the testimony of Christ himself, saying: "Give," or rather, "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's¹." Now Cæsar claimed tribute as lord of the country, and therefore he was truly lord and king of it. That Cæsar held not of or from Christ as man, it is evident; and much more, that Christ, who wholly refused to be a king, did never acknowledge to hold any kingdom from mortal man. The sixth, that was the kingdom of Christ whereof the prophets prophesied; but they prophesied not of any earthly kingdom; therefore Christ's kingdom was not earthly. That they prophesied not of any earthly kingdom, it is evident, in that the kingdom they prophesied of was to be confirmed and restored by him; but the earthly kingdom of Judæa was not confirmed by the coming of Christ, but upon the refusal of him utterly overthrown; therefore it was not that the prophets prophesied of. That the kingdom they prophesied of was to be confirmed, restored, and bettered, the words of the prophets are proof sufficient: "Behold, the day cometh, saith the Lord, and I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign, and he shall be wise, and shall do judgment and justice in the earth. In those days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell boldly. And this is the name that they shall call him by, The Lord our Righteousness²." And again: "A little child is born unto us, and the principality or rule is on his shoulders. His name shall be called Wonderful, the Mighty God, Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace; the increase of his government and peace shall have no end. He shall sit upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order, and to stablish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever³." Now, that the kingdom of Judæa was not established, but utterly overthrown immediately after Christ's de-

¹ Matth. xxii. 21.² Jer. xxiii. 5, &c.³ Isai. ix. 6.

parture hence, upon and for the refusal of him, the words of Christ foretelling it, and the event of things answering unto his prediction, are proof sufficient: "The day shall come upon thee," saith Christ to Jerusalem, the chief city of that kingdom, "that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and hold thee in straight on every side; they shall cast thee to the earth, and thy children that are in thee, and shall not leave a stone upon a stone, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation¹."

Thus we see it strongly proved² that Christ himself was no temporal or earthly king, and therefore much less Peter, or the pope, that pretendeth to be Christ's vicar and Peter's successor. Notwithstanding, they that are otherwise minded endeavour to prove that Christ was a temporal king, and that he left a kingly power to Peter and his successors. First, out of scripture strangely wrested. Secondly, out of the testimonies of popes (for better authorities they have none). The principal text of scripture which they allege is in the gospel of Saint Matthew, where our Saviour saith, "All power is given me in heaven and in earth³." But Bellarmine⁴ telleth them, and the best divines agree with him, that that place is not to be understood of a temporal power, such as earthly kings have, but either of a spiritual, whereby Christ so reigneth in earth in the hearts of men by faith, as he doth in heaven in the presence of his glory among the angels, or a divine power over all creatures, not communicable to mortal men. The former of these interpretations the author of the Interlineal Gloss followeth⁵; the latter, Lyra upon this place⁶: his words are: *Licet Christus, quantum ad divinitatem ab*

¹ Luke xix. 43.

² To which purpose see Waldensis, Doctr. Fid. Lib. II. Art. 3. cap. 76, 77.

³ Matth. xxviii. 18.

⁴ "Respondeo potestatem de qua hic loquitur Dominus non esse potestatem temporalem, ut regum terrenorum, sed vel tantum spirituales...vel esse potestatem quamdam summam in omnes creaturas, non temporalem sed divinam, vel divinæ simillimam, quæ non potest communicari homini mortali."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 5. [Tom. I. p. 437.]

⁵ "Ut qui ante regnabat in cœlo, per fidem regnet in terris."—Gloss. Interlin and loc.

⁶ Lyra in loc. [Tom. v. col. 471. Antv. 1634.]

æterno haberet hanc potestatem, et in quantum homo, ab instanti conceptionis, haberet potestatem in cælo, et in terra, authoritative, tamen executive non habuit ante resurrectionem suam, sed voluit esse passibilitati subjectus propter nostram redemptionem: that is, “Although Christ, in that he was God, had this power from all eternity, and in that he was man, had power both in heaven and in earth, from the first moment of his conception in respect of authority, yet in respect of the execution and performance of the acts of it, he had it not before his resurrection, but was pleased to be subject to passibility for our redemption.”

Let us come therefore from the scripture to the testimonies of later popes; for fathers, ancient councils, or ancient bishops of Rome, they have none to speak for them. The first pope that they allege, is pope Nicholas¹, in a certain epistle of his, where he saith (as they tell us) that Christ committed and gave unto blessed Peter, the key-bearer of eternal life, the rights both of the earthly and heavenly empire. To this authority first we answer, that pope Nicholas hath no such words in any epistle; howsoever Gratian, who citeth them as the words of Nicholas, mistook the matter. Secondly, that supposing the words to be the words of Nicholas, his meaning may be, that the spiritual power of binding and loosing, which Christ left to Peter, is not only of force in earth, but in heaven also, that being bound in heaven that is bound on earth, and they being repulsed from the throne of grace in heaven, and excluded from God’s favours, that are rejected from the holy altars, and put from the sacraments of the church. Whereupon Chrysostom² saith, that the power of the Church directeth and commandeth the very tribunal of heaven, and addeth, that heaven taketh authority of judging

¹ “Illam (Romanam ecclesiam) solus ille fundavit, et super petram fidei mox nascentis erexit, qui beato æternæ vitæ clavigero terreni simul et cœlestis imperii jura commisit.”—Epist. Nicolai papæ II. citat. a Gratiano. Decret. [Part. I.] Dist. 22. cap. ‘Omnis.’ [col. 107. Par. 1612.]

² “Ὁ γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης θρόνος ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἱδρύται, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖ διέπειν ἐπιτέτραπται. τίς ταῦτά φησιν; αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλεὺς.... ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς κρίσεως λαμβάνει ὁ οὐρανός. Ἐπειδὴ ὁ κριτὴς ἐν τῇ γῇ κάθεται, ὁ δεσπότης ἔπεται τῷ δούλῳ, καὶ ἅπερ αὐτὸς οὗτος κάτω κρίνει ταῦτα ἐκεῖνος ἄνω κυροῖ.”—Chrysost. De Verb. Esaiæ. ‘Vidi Dominum.’ Hom. v. [Tom. vi. p. 132.]

from the earth; for that the judge sitteth on earth, and the Lord followeth the sentence of his servants, according to that of Christ, "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven¹." Others expound the supposed words of pope Nicholas of the spiritual power of Peter over the good and bad in the visible Church, the good being named the kingdom of heaven, and the bad an earthly kingdom or company. But howsoever, it is most certain that pope Nicholas, in his epistle to Michael the emperor, hath the clean contrary to that which some would charge him with. For there he sheweth that howsoever before Christ some were both kings and priests, as was Melchisedeck, and as likewise some other among the Pagans were, yet after Christ none were so. Neither did the emperor take unto him the rights of the chief priesthood, nor the chief priest the name of the emperor. *Sed mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus, sic actibus propriis et dignitatibus distinctis, officia potestatis utriusque discrevit, ut et Christiani imperatores pro æterna vita pontificibus indigerent, et pontifices pro cursu temporalium tantummodo rerum imperialibus legibus uterentur*²: that is, "But the Mediator of God and men, the man Christ, did so distinguish and sever the duties and offices of either of these kinds of power by their proper actions, and distinct dignities, that both Christian emperors should stand in need of bishops for the attaining of eternal life, and that bishops should use the laws of emperors for the course of temporal things only: that so both the spiritual action and employment might be free from carnal turmoils, and that he who goeth on warfare unto God, might not at all be entangled with secular businesses; and that on the other side, he might not seem to be set over the things that are divine, whom the businesses of this world should possess: that both the modesty of each of these orders and degrees might be preserved, and that also, no one having both these kinds of power, should be lifted up too high." The next authority is that of Bonifacius the Eighth, who hath these words³ (speaking of the Church, which is one, and whereof he

¹ Matth. xvi. 19.

² [Epist. viii. Nicolai ad Michael. Labbe, Tom. ix. col. 1344.]

³ "In hac ejusque potestate duos esse gladios, spiritualement videlicet, et temporalem, evangelicis dictis instruimur. Nam dicentibus apostolis 'Ecce gladii duo hic;' in ecclesia scilicet, cum apostoli loquerentur, non

supposeth the bishop of Rome to be the head): “We are instructed by the evangelical sayings, that in this Church, and in the power of it, there are two swords, to wit, a spiritual and a temporal. For when the apostles said, ‘Behold, here are two swords,’ to wit, in the Church (because they were the apostles that spake), the Lord did not answer that it was too much, but that it was enough; and therefore surely, whosoever denieth the temporal sword to be in the power of Peter, seemeth not well to consider the word of the Lord commanding him to sheath his sword.” The answer unto this authority is easy. For Bonifacius (as Duarenus noteth¹) was a vain, busy, turbulent, arrogant, and proud man, presuming above that which was fit, and challenging that which no way pertained unto him; and therefore we may justly reject both him and his sayings. But for the words of our Saviour, it is evident that they prove no such thing as this pope would inforce out of them. “Some,” saith Maldonatus², “from these words would prove that the Church hath two swords, the one spiritual, the other temporal; which, whether it have or have not, cannot be proved out of this place, where other swords

respondit Dominus nimis esse sed satis. Certe qui in potestate Petri temporale gladium esse negat, male verbum attendit Domini proferentis, ‘Converte gladium tuum in vaginam.’”—Bonifac. VIII. In extrav. De Majorit. et Obed. cap. ‘Unam sanctam.’ [Extrav. Comm. Lib. i. col. 207. Lugd. 1624.]

¹ “Nec mirum est, ab insolenti homine, impotentisque animi, qualem describunt Bonifacium historici, constitutionem adeo injustam et ab omni æquitate abhorrentem emanasse.”—Duaren. De Sacr. Eccles. Ministr. et Benef. Lib. vii. cap. 10. [p. 1202. Francof. 1598.]

² “Alii recentiores interpretes duos ex hoc loco gladios ecclesiam habere colligunt, alterum spirituales temporales alterum, quos ut habeat, ex hoc certe loco non habet, ubi de aliis agitur gladiis.... Quod Christus respondit ‘satis est,’ non confirmat discipulorum opinionem existimantium gladiis gerendam rem esse; sed ut ait Theophylactus, ironice respondet. Aut ut idem Theophylactus et Euthymius putant, cum dicit, ‘satis est,’ indicat opus non esse gladiis, non quod necessitas temporis non postularet, sed quod ipse nollet gladiis se defendere.... Toto denique hoc loco divinitatem suam, ut Theophylactus observavit, Christus ostendit, dum prædicat apostolis instare tempus passionis suæ, quam eo ipse indicat voluntariam sibi esse non necessariam. Propterea enim simul dicit et gladiis opus esse, et gladiis non opus esse, cum dicit satis esse duos: sit altera re mortem suam instare indicet; altera voluntariam sibi esse doceat.”—Maldonat. in Luc. xxii. [col. 1234. Lugd. 1598.]

are meant than either of civil or ecclesiastical authority. Our Saviour telleth his disciples, the times approaching will be such as that a man had need for his own defence to sell his coat to buy a sword. Whereupon the disciples, supposing they should use material swords in their own defence, answer that they have two swords. To whom Christ replieth, that it is enough; not confirming their erring opinion, but answering them ironically, as Theophylact and Euthymius think. Or otherwise, letting them understand, that though the times would be such as that many swords would not suffice to defend them, yet that these two were enough, because he meant to use none at all, but to suffer all that the malice of his enemies could do unto him." This Maldonatus delivereth to be the literal sense of Christ's words, and sheweth a mystical sense of them also out of Beda, much more apt than that of Bonifacius. *Duo gladii*, saith Beda, *sufficiunt ad testimonium sponte passi salvatoris. Unus, qui et apostolis audaciam pro domino certandi; et evulsa ictu ejus auricula, domino etiam morituro pietatem, virtutemque doceret inesse medicandi. Alter, qui nequaquam vagina exemptus, ostenderet eos nec totum quod potuere, pro ejus defensione facere permissos*: that is, "Two swords are sufficient to give testimony unto our Saviour that he suffered willingly. The one of which might show that the apostles wanted no courage to fight for their master; and by the ear that was cut off by the stroke thereof, and healed again by the Lord, that he wanted neither piety to compassionate the miserable, nor virtue and power to make him whole that was hurt, though now he were ready to die. And the other, which never was drawn out of the sheath, might shew that they were not permitted to do all that they could have done in his defence." It is not to be denied but that S. Bernard¹, mystically expounding the words of Christ, saith the Church hath two swords of authority. But he thinketh it hath them in very different sort. For it hath the use of the one, and the benefit of the other. The one is to be drawn by it, the other for it. So

¹ "Uterque ecclesiæ, et spiritualis scilicet gladius, et materialis; sed is quidem pro ecclesia, ille vero et ab ecclesia exserendus est. Ille sacerdotis, is militis manu, sed sane ad nutum sacerdotis, et jussum imperatoris."—Bernard. De Considerat. Ad Eugen. Lib. iv. [cap. 3. Tom. i. col. 438. B. Par. 1690.]

that this is all that he saith, that the sword of civil authority is to be used by the soldier's hand, at the command of the emperor, by the direction and at the suit of the Church. From Bonifacius they pass to Innocentius the Third, who, in the vacancy of the empire, willed those that were wronged in their rightful causes to have recourse either to some bishop, or to himself¹; and Clemens the Fifth, who professeth to intermeddle with certain secular businesses and affairs, and to determine certain civil causes, upon three several grounds². Whereof the first is, his greatness, making him superior to the emperor. The second, his being instead of the emperor, in the vacancy of the empire. And the third, the fulness of power, which Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, gave unto Peter, and in him to his successors. Whatsoever we think of the former of these two popes, who seemeth to ground his intermeddling in civil affairs upon some law of the empire, and concession of civil princes, accordingly as we read of Theodosius³, that he permitted any laymen having civil differences among themselves, to refer the same to ecclesiastical judges, if they listed. (Which concession proceeding *ex pietate*, not *ex debito*, that is, out of piety, and not out of any right or necessity that it must be so, is long since grown out of use: the state of churchmen being much changed from that it was when he granted them that privilege, as Duarenus sheweth⁴). Yet pope Clemens can by no means be

¹ "Si se in aliquo senserint prægravari, ad tuam (sicut hactenus servatum est), vel ad nostram si maluerint, audientiam appellare."—Innocent. III. cap. 'Licet.' De Foro Competenti. [Clementin. Lib. II. Tit. 2. col. 87. Par. 1612.]

² "Nos tamen ex superioritate quam ad imperium non est dubium nos habere, quam ex potestate in qua vacante imperio imperatori succedimus, et nihilominus ex illius plenitudine potestatis quam Christus, Rex regum et Dominus dominantium, nobis licet immeritis in persona beati Petri concessit," &c.—Clement. Lib. II. Tit. 11. De Sententia et Re Judicata. [col. 128.]

³ "Quicumque litem habens, sive possessor, sive petitor fuerit, vel in initio litis, vel de cursis temporum curriculis, sive cum negotium peroratur, sive cum jam cœperit promi sententia, judicium sacrosanctæ sedis antistitis, illico sine aliqua dubitatione, etiam si alia pars refragatur, ad episcoporum judicium cum sermone litigantium dirigatur."—Theodos. in Decret. Gratian. Part. II. Caus. 11. Quæst. 1. [cap. 35. col. 989. Par. 1612.]

⁴ "Idque si unquam alias maxime hoc sæculo necessarium est quo

excused from heretical impiety, affirming that which is most untrue, as may appear by the manifold reasons brought before to prove the contrary; nor from antichristian pride, in seeking to tread underneath his feet the crowns and dignities of kings and princes, and to lift himself up above all that is called God.

CHAPTER XLV.

OF THE POPE'S UNJUST CLAIM TO INTERMEDDLE WITH THE AFFAIRS OF PRINCES AND THEIR STATES, IF NOT AS SOVEREIGN LORD OVER ALL, YET AT LEAST *IN ORDINE AD SPIRITUALIA*, AND IN CASE OF PRINCES FAILING TO DO THEIR DUTIES.

THAT Christ was no earthly king, that he left no kingly power to Peter, and that the pope hath no mere temporal power, in that he is Christ's vicar, or Peter's successor, it is most evident out of the former discourse, and the cardinal Jesuit confesseth so much; and yet¹ he thinketh the pope hath a supreme power to dispose of all temporal states and things, *in ordine ad bonum spirituale*, that is, in a kind of reference to the procuring and setting forward of the spiritual good. But this fancy is most easily refuted by unanswerable reasons presupposing his former concession.

For first, no man can take away, limit, or restrain any power, or the exercise of it, but he in whom it is in eminent sort, and from whom it was received. But the civil power that is in princes is not in the pope, neither did it proceed and come originally from him; therefore it cannot be restrained, limited, or taken away by him. The major proposition is

episcopatus et sacerdotia in doctissimis hominibus et a religione alienis deferri solent. Priscis temporibus rarum ac prodigio simile habebatur, aliquem ecclesiæ præfici, qui divinarum literarum doctor non esset, nec ideo laicorum contemnebatur judicium. Cum igitur hodie episcopi nostri, paucis exceptis, sacrarum literarum scientia cæteris ex populo longe inferiores sint, quonam ore soli de rebus divinis judicium sibi arrogabunt.—Duaren. De Eccles. Minist. ac Benef. Lib. i. cap. 2. [p. 1159. Francof. 1592.]

¹ Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 6. [p. 439.]

that this is all that he saith, that the sword of civil authority is to be used by the soldier's hand, at the command of the emperor, by the direction and at the suit of the Church. From Bonifacius they pass to Innocentius the Third, who, in the vacancy of the empire, willed those that were wronged in their rightful causes to have recourse either to some bishop, or to himself¹; and Clemens the Fifth, who professeth to intermeddle with certain secular businesses and affairs, and to determine certain civil causes, upon three several grounds². Whereof the first is, his greatness, making him superior to the emperor. The second, his being instead of the emperor, in the vacancy of the empire. And the third, the fulness of power, which Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, gave unto Peter, and in him to his successors. Whatsoever we think of the former of these two popes, who seemeth to ground his intermeddling in civil affairs upon some law of the empire, and concession of civil princes, accordingly as we read of Theodosius³, that he permitted any laymen having civil differences among themselves, to refer the same to ecclesiastical judges, if they listed. (Which concession proceeding *ex pietate*, not *ex debito*, that is, out of piety, and not out of any right or necessity that it must be so, is long since grown out of use: the state of churchmen being much changed from that it was when he granted them that privilege, as Duarenus sheweth⁴). Yet pope Clemens can by no means be

¹ "Si se in aliquo senserint prægravari, ad tuam (sicut hactenus servatum est), vel ad nostram si maluerint, audientiam appellare."—Innocent. III. cap. 'Licet.' De Foro Competenti. [Clementin. Lib. II. Tit. 2. col. 87. Par. 1612.]

² "Nos tamen ex superioritate quam ad imperium non est dubium nos habere, quam ex potestate in qua vacante imperio imperatori succedimus, et nihilominus ex illius plenitudine potestatis quam Christus, Rex regum et Dominus dominantium, nobis licet immeritis in persona beati Petri concessit," &c.—Clement. Lib. II. Tit. 11. De Sententia et Re Judicata. [col. 128.]

³ "Quicumque litem habens, sive possessor, sive petitor fuerit, vel in initio litis, vel de cursis temporum curriculis, sive cum negotium peroratur, sive cum jam cœperit promi sententia, judicium sacrosanctæ sedis antistitis, illico sine aliqua dubitatione, etiam si alia pars refragatur, ad episcoporum judicium cum sermone litigantium dirigatur."—Theodos. in Decret. Gratian. Part. II. Caus. 11. Quæst. 1. [cap. 35. col. 989. Par. 1612.]

⁴ "Idque si unquam alias maxime hoc sæculo necessarium est quo

excused from heretical impiety, affirming that which is most untrue, as may appear by the manifold reasons brought before to prove the contrary; nor from antichristian pride, in seeking to tread underneath his feet the crowns and dignities of kings and princes, and to lift himself up above all that is called God.

CHAPTER XLV.

OF THE POPE'S UNJUST CLAIM TO INTERMEDDLE WITH THE AFFAIRS OF PRINCES AND THEIR STATES, IF NOT AS SOVEREIGN LORD OVER ALL, YET AT LEAST *IN ORDINE AD SPIRITUALIA*, AND IN CASE OF PRINCES FAILING TO DO THEIR DUTIES.

THAT Christ was no earthly king, that he left no kingly power to Peter, and that the pope hath no mere temporal power, in that he is Christ's vicar, or Peter's successor, it is most evident out of the former discourse, and the cardinal Jesuit confesseth so much; and yet¹ he thinketh the pope hath a supreme power to dispose of all temporal states and things, *in ordine ad bonum spirituale*, that is, in a kind of reference to the procuring and setting forward of the spiritual good. But this fancy is most easily refuted by unanswerable reasons presupposing his former concession.

For first, no man can take away, limit, or restrain any power, or the exercise of it, but he in whom it is in eminent sort, and from whom it was received. But the civil power that is in princes is not in the pope, neither did it proceed and come originally from him; therefore it cannot be restrained, limited, or taken away by him. The major proposition is

episcopatus et sacerdotia in doctissimis hominibus et a religione alienis deferri solent. Priscis temporibus rarum ac prodigio simile habebatur, aliquem ecclesiæ præfici, qui divinarum literarum doctor non esset, nec ideo laicorum contemnebatur judicium. Cum igitur hodie episcopi nostri, paucis exceptis, sacrarum literarum scientia cæteris ex populo longe inferiores sint, quonam ore soli de rebus divinis judicium sibi arrogabunt."—Duaren. De Eccles. Minist. ac Benef. Lib. i. cap. 2. [p. 1159. Francof. 1592.]

¹ Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 6. [p. 439.]

evident; the assumption is proved, because civil power is in heathen infidels, who no way hold of the pope. Secondly, because it is agreed by all divines of worth and learning, that the civil power, in the first original of it, is immediately from God; or if not immediately by his own delivery thereof, yet by no other mediation than that of the law of nature and nations. "The emperors know," saith Tertullian¹, "who gave them the empire; they know that it was even the same God who gave unto them to be men, and to have human souls. They well perceive that he only is God in whose only power they are:" *a quo sunt secundi, post quem primi, ante omnes, et super omnes deos*: that is, "After whom they are in order the second, but among all other the first, before and above all gods." And again, *Inde est imperator, unde et homo antequam imperator; inde potestas illi, unde et spiritus*: that is, "From thence is the chief ruler and emperor, whence he was a man before he was an emperor: from thence hath he his power from whence he received the spirit of life." The author of the answer to the reports of a great and worthy judge among us, who hath lately written in the defence of the pope's overspreading greatness, seemeth in part to agree with Tertullian², and telleth us, that "civil power is received from God, not immediately by his own delivery thereof, but mediately rather by the mediation of the law of nature and nations. For by the law of nature God hath ordained that there should be politic government, which the law of nations assuming, hath transferred that government to one, or more, according to the divers forms thereof." And Occam³ proveth at large that imperial power is not from the pope, and that it is heretical to say, that all lawful civil power is from the pope.

Our second reason is this: absolute and sovereign civil princes, while they were infidels, had true dominion, rule and authority, holding it as immediately from God, not depending on

¹ "Sciunt quis illis dederit imperium, sciunt qua homines, quis et animam. Sentiunt eum esse Deum solum, in cujus solius potestate sunt, a quo sunt secundi, post quem primi, ante omnes et super omnes deos."—Tertull. Apologet. advers. Gent. cap. 30. [p. 27. Par. 1675.]

² Answer to [the fifth part of] the reports of Sir Edward Cooke ['by a Catholic Divine.' (Robert Parsons. See Alegamb. Biblioth. Script. Jesuit: Pitseus, de Illustr. Angl. Script. sub ann. 1610: Wood, Athen. Oxon. ii. 77)], Chap. ii. p. 26. [4to. sine loc. 1606.]

³ Dialog. Lib. II. Tractat. 2. Part. III. cap. 22.

any ruler of the Church, as hath been showed before. But when they become Christians, they still remain in the same fulness of authority, in as ample and independent sort as before, because the benefit of Christ tendeth to no man's hurt, and grace overthroweth not nature; therefore still they remain independent and subject to none in the same power, and in the exercise of it. If they shall say, they are subject to none while they use their authority well, but that if they abuse it, they lose the independent absoluteness thereof; their saying will be found to be heretical. For if upon abuse of independent authority, they that have it lose and forfeit it *ipso facto*, then authority and abuse of authority, or at least extreme abuse of it, cannot stand together; which is contrary to that of Saint Augustine, where he saith¹: *Nec tyrannicæ factionis perversitas laudabilis erit, si regia clementia tyrannus subditos tractet, nec vituperabilis ordo regicæ potestatis, si rex crudelitate tyrannica sæviat: aliud est namque injusta potestate juste velle uti; et aliud est justa potestate injuste velle uti*: that is, "Neither shall the perverseness of tyrannical usurpation ever be praiseworthy, though the tyrant use his subjects with all kingly clemency, nor the order of kingly power ever be subject to just reprehension, though a king grow fierce and cruel like a tyrant. For it is one thing to use an unlawful power lawfully, and another thing to use a lawful power unrighteously and unjustly."

The third reason may be this. If God did give to the pope authority to depose princes, erring and abusing their authority, he would give them the means to execute that their authority reacheth unto, to wit, civil greatness, armies of soldiers, walled cities, towers, and strongholds, both for defence and offence, and all other things necessary for the putting down of wicked kings. But the pope as Christ's vicar hath none of these, neither was he at any time as a temporal prince the greatest monarch of the world, and so able to repress the insolencies of all heretical, pagan, and wicked kings, hindering the peaceable proceeding of the gospel of Christ; therefore he hath no such authority. For to say that God giveth authority, and not the means whereby it may execute and perform that which pertaineth to it, is impious. The only means the pope hath to depose princes are two; but neither of them

¹ Aug. De Bono Conjugali, cap. 14. [Tom. vi. col. 329.]

within the compass of his power to dispose of. The first, is the raising of subjects against their prince. The second, is the raising of neighbour princes. The former of these means is very defective, seeing (as Bellarmine¹ rightly observeth out of Ecclesiasticus) "Such as the ruler of a city is, such are they that dwell in it²:" and therefore if the king be an heretic, the most part of his people will be so too, and rather assist him for the maintenance of his heresy, than resist against him for the suppressing of it. Which thing (as he saith) experience teacheth. For when Jeroboam³ became an idolater, the greatest part of the kingdom worshipped idols. When Constantine reigned, Christian religion flourished. When Constantius reigned, Arianism prevailed, and overflowed all. When Julian swayed the sceptre, the greatest part returned to paganism. So that Jovian being chosen after his death, refused to be emperor, protesting that being a Christian, he neither could nor would be emperor over infidels⁴. Whereupon they all professed, that howsoever they had dissembled before, yet they were still in heart Christians, and now would show it again. So that we see, the first means for the suppressing of erring princes, is no means, or a very uncertain one. And a second is worse than the first: for I never read in any divine, of what religion soever, that one king is bound to make war upon another, upon the pope's command, for the suppressing of heresy. And therefore the pope may breathe out excommunications till he be breathless, but can go no farther by any means that God hath given him.

Fourthly, thus we reason. Either the power of the pope is merely ecclesiastical and spiritual, or it is not. If it be not, then hath he civil authority from Christ, which they deny. If it be, then can it inflict no punishments but merely spiritual and ecclesiastical. For of what nature each power is, of the same are the punishments it inflicteth. The temporal power inflicteth only temporal, outward, and corporal punishments,

¹ De Pont. Lib. v. cap. 7. [p. 440.]

² Ecclus. x. 2.

³ 1 Kings xii. 30.

⁴ "Τότε αἰρεθεῖς εἰς τὸ βασιλεῦσαι παρητέιτο· βία τε ἐλκόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν, ἐβόα μὴ βούλεσθαι λέγων βασιλεύειν ἀνθρώπων Ἑλληνίζειν προαιρουμένων, αὐτὸς ὢν Χριστιανός. Ὡς οὖν φωνὴ κοινῇ πάντων ἐγένετο, ὁμολογοῦσα καὶ αὐτοὺς εἶναι Χριστιανούς, δέχεται μὲν τὴν βασιλείαν."—Socrat. H. E. III. 22.

as loss of goods, imprisonment, banishment, or death. The spiritual only spiritual, as suspension, excommunication, and the like. Now I suppose the loss of a kingdom, with all the riches and honour of it, and captivity, banishment, or death, upon resistance against the sentence of deposition, is a temporal and external punishment of the worst nature and highest degree that may be.

Lastly, if sovereign kings may be put from their kingdoms upon abuse of their authority, either they forfeit and lose the right of them *ipso facto*, and are deprived by Almighty God; and then the pope can but declare what God hath already done, as any man else may upon perfect understanding of the case: or else other neighbour kings, or their own subjects, are to depose them, and the pope is only to put them in mind of their duty, and as a spiritual pastor to urge them to the performance of it: and then he deposeth them not, but they. Or lastly, the power of assuming their authority to himself, upon their abuse thereof, pertaineth unto him; and then in civil authority he is the greatest and over all: which yet these men deny. For he that is to judge of princes' actions, and upon dislike to limit, restrain, or wholly take their power from them, is supreme in that kind of authority. And if he may take civil authority from other, and give it to whom he pleaseth, there is no question but he may give it unto himself, and so hath power, upon all defects of princes, to take into his hand that which formerly pertained to them, and to do the acts that were to be performed by them.

Now as these reasons strongly prove that the pope cannot depose princes *in ordine ad spiritualia*, so the weakness of the reasons brought to prove it will much more confirm the same. Their first reason is taken from the perfection and excellency of the ecclesiastical or spiritual power, which they say is greater and far more excellent than that which is civil. Whereunto we answer with Waldensis¹, that though the spiritual power be simply more perfect and excellent than the civil, yet either of these in the performance of things pertain-

¹ "Ergo magis placet, ut sint duæ potestates primæ: et neutra ab altera secundum originem: et hæc illi subjecta secundum perfectionis simplicis dignitatem, utraque tamen major altera sibi comparata in suo exercitio potestatis, ubi intervenit ratio debitæ servitutis."—Waldensis, Doctrinal. Fid. Lib. II. Art. 3. cap. 78. [Tom. I. p. 390. Ven. 1571.]

ing to them is greater than the other, and each of them independent of the other. Ambrose was greater than Theodosius in respect of the administration of divine things, and might either admit him to or reject him from the sacraments. But Theodosius in respect of all temporal things was greater than he, and might command him, send him into banishment, or take away all that he had. The sun is more excellent than the moon, and the influence thereof more powerful; yet is there a kind of influence upon the waters wherein the moon is more excellent than the sun. In like sort, the power which is spiritual may do greater things than that which is temporal, and yet the temporal may do those things the spiritual cannot do. And therefore it will not follow that the ecclesiastical state, and the principal ministers of the Church, may take unto themselves the authority of kings, or take upon them to do the things that pertain to kingly offices, because they are greater in dignity, and have a greater power; unless they had a greater dignity and power in the same kind. Now they who most amplify the greatness of ecclesiastical power, preferring it before the other which is civil, never make the greatness of it to consist in that in civil affairs it may do more than that; but in that it hath a more noble object, and more wonderful effects. "We also," saith Nazianzen¹, "have power and authority, and that far more ample and excellent than that of civil princes, insomuch as it is fit the flesh should yield to the spirit, and things earthly to things heavenly." "Priesthood," saith Chrysostom², "is a principedom, more honourable and great

¹ "Ἀρχομεν γὰρ καὶ αὐτοί· προσθήσω δὲ ὅτι καὶ τὴν μείζονα καὶ τελεωτέραν ἀρχήν· ἥ δεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑποχωρῆσαι τῇ σαρκί, καὶ τοῖς γήϊνους τὰ ἐπουράνια."—Greg. Naz. Orat. Ad cives trepidantes. [Orat. xvii. § 8. Tom. i. p. 323. Par. 1778.]

² "Ἱερωσύνη γὰρ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς βασιλείας σεμνοτέρα, καὶ μείζων ἐστὶν ἀρχή. Μὴ γάρ μοι τὴν ἀλουργίδα εἶπης, μηδὲ τὸ διάδημα, μηδὲ τὰ ἱμάτια τὰ χρυσᾶ. Σκιὰ πάντα ἐκεῖνα, καὶ τῶν ἐαρινῶν ἀνθῶν εὐτελέστερα.... Μηδὲ ταῦτά μοι λέγε, ἀλλ' εἰ βούλει ἱερέως πρὸς βασιλέα τὸ διάφορον ἰδεῖν, τῆς ἐκάστῳ διδομένης ἐξουσίας τὸ μέτρον ἐξέτασον, καὶ πολλῶ τοῦ βασιλέως ὑψηλότερα ὄψει τὸν ἱερέα καθήμενον. Εἴ γὰρ καὶ σεμνὸς ἡμῖν ὁ θρόνος φαίνεται ὁ βασιλικὸς ἀπὸ τῶν προσπεπηγότων αὐτῷ λίθων, καὶ τοῦ περισφίγγοντος αὐτὸν χρυσίου, ἀλλ' ὅμως τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔλαχεν οἰκονομεῖν καὶ πλείον ἔχει τῆς ἐξουσίας ταύτης οὐδέν· ὁ δὲ τῆς ἱερωσύνης θρόνος ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἱδρύται, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖ διέπειν ἐπιτέτραπται."—Chrysost. Hom. v. De Verb. Esaiæ, 'Vidi Dominum.' [Tom. vi. p. 132.]

than a kingdom; tell not me of the purple, diadem, sceptre, or golden apparel of kings, for these are but shadows, and more vain than flowers at the spring-time. If you will see the difference between them, and how much the king is inferior to the priest, consider the manner of the power delivered to them both, and you shall see the priest's tribunal much higher than that of the king, who hath received only the administration of earthly things. But the priest's tribunal is placed in heaven, and he hath authority to pronounce sentence in heavenly affairs." And again¹, "Earthly princes have power to bind but our bodies only, but the bands which priests can lay upon us do touch the soul itself, and reach even unto the heavens, so far forth, as that whatsoever priests shall determine here beneath, that God doth ratify above in heaven, and confirm the sentence of his servants upon earth." When king Richard the First returning from the holy land was taken and holden as a prisoner by duke Leopold of Austria and the emperor Henry the Sixth, Queen Elenor his mother seeking all means to procure his deliverance, among other things wrote a letter to the bishop of Rome, entreating him to interpose his authority². The words of her letter are these, expressing the passion and earnest desire of her heart. "This only remaineth, O father, that you draw forth the sword of Peter against malefactors; which sword God hath appointed to be over nations and kingdoms. The cross of Christ doth excel the eagles that are in Cæsar's banners, the spiritual sword of

¹ "Οὗτος μὲν γὰρ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔλαχεν οἰκονομεῖν· ὁ δὲ τῆς ἱερωσύνης θεσμὸς ἄνω κάθεται, ὅσα ἂν δῆσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. Ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰ ἐνταῦθα πεπίστευται, ἐγὼ τὰ οὐράνια, ἐγὼ ὅταν εἴπω, τὸν ἱερέα λέγω."—Id. Hom. iv. [p. 127.]

² "Illud restat, ut exeratis in maleficos pater, gladium Petri quem ad hoc constituit super gentes et regna. Christi crux antecellit Cæsaris aquilis, gladius Petri gladio Constantini, et apostolica sedes præjudicat imperatoriæ potestati. Vestra potestas a Deo est, an ab hominibus? Nonne Deus Deorum locutus est vobis in Petro apostolo dicens; 'Quodcunque ligaveris super terram erit ligatum et in cœlis; et quodcunque solveris super terram erit solutum et in cœlis.' Quare ergo tanto tempore tam negligenter, imo tam crudeliter filium meum solvere differtis, aut potius non audetis? Sed dicetis hanc potestatem vobis in animabus non in corporibus fuisse commissam. Esto. Certe sufficit nobis si eorum ligaveritis animas, qui filium meum ligatum in carcere tenent."—Petr. Blesens. Epist. cxlvi. [Magn. Bibl. Vet. Patr. Tom. xii. Part. ii. p. 823.]

Peter is of more power than was the temporal sword of Constantine the emperor, and the see apostolic is more potent than any imperial power or authority: and I would ask, whether your power be of God or of men? Did not the God of gods speak to you in Peter the apostle, saying, ‘Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven?’ and why then do you so negligently, or rather cruelly delay, for a long time to loose my son? or why dare you not do it? Perhaps you will say that the power given you by God of binding and loosing is for souls, and not for bodies. Let it be so; truly it is sufficient for us if you will bind the souls of those that hold my son’s body bound in prison.” By all these sayings of them that most admired the excellency of priesthood, it appeareth that the excellency thereof above princely power is in respect of the object thereof, which is more noble; and the effects thereof, which are more wonderful; and not in respect of greater power, authority, and right to dispose of temporal affairs and businesses, either simply, or upon any abuse or negligence of civil princes. So that from hence it cannot be inferred that the chief ministers of the Church may depose the princes of the world. Hugo de Sancto Victore¹ saith: “There are two kinds of power, the one terrene, the head whereof is the king; the other spiritual, the head whereof is the pope. To the king’s power those things pertain that are terrene; to the pope’s, those that are spiritual; and look how much the spiritual life is better than the earthly, so much doth the spiritual power excel the earthly in honour and dignity. For the spiritual power doth constitute the terrene power, that it may be, and judgeth it whether it proceed aright, or not. But itself was first instituted of God, and when it goeth

¹ “Terrena potestas caput habet regem. Spiritualis potestas habet summum pontificem. Ad potestatem regiam pertinent quæ terrena sunt, et ad terrenam vitam facta omnia. Ad potestatem summi pontificis pertinent quæ spiritualia sunt, et vitæ spirituali attributa universa. Quanto autem vita spiritualis dignior est quam terrena, et spiritus quam corpus, tanto spiritualis potestas terrenam sive secularem potestatem honore ac dignitate præcedit. Nam spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem et instruere habet, ut sit; et judicare habet, si bona non fuerit. Ipsa vero a Deo primum instituta est; et cum deviat, a solo Deo judicari potest.”—Hugo de Sancto Victore. De Sacram. Fid. Lib. II. Part. II. cap. 4. [Tom. III. p. 607. Rothom. 1648.]

aside, can be judged of none but of God only." From hence, as Waldensis showeth¹, some men took an occasion of error, affirming that the root of terrene power doth so far forth depend upon the pope, that by commission from him the execution of things pertaining thereunto is derived unto the prince; and that when the prince goeth aside or faileth to do his duty, the chief bishop may manage the civil affairs; because, he saith, the spiritual power doth institute the civil power, that it may be. But these men presume too far, and in so doing offend, because the terrene power of kings is not reduced into any other originally, as having authority over kings, but unto Christ only; and yet notwithstanding, as the priest joineth the man and his wife in marriage, and blesseth them that they may be man and wife, and joyful parents of happy children, and judgeth afterwards whether they perform the duties of marriage or not; so the chief priest setteth the crown upon the head of the emperor, anointeth him with holy oil, taketh an oath of him for the defence of the Christian faith and religion, putteth upon him the royal robes, and thereby investeth him with royal power, and putteth him in possession of his imperial state and dignity. "But it is not to be imagined," saith Waldensis, "that the imperial power is from the power of the Church, or dependeth of it, though certain solemnities be used by bishops in the inauguration of kings and emperors; neither may the chief ministers of the Church any more challenge the disposing or managing of civil affairs, upon any defect or failing of civil princes, than they may the administration and dispensation of holy things, upon the defect or failing of the ecclesiastical ministers. Yet in case of necessity, either of these two states may and ought to help

¹ "Ex hac autem particula occasionaliter delinquant quidam dicentes quod radix potestatis terrenæ in tantum dependet a papa, ut ex commissione ejus executio derivetur in principem, et principe deviante potest summus sacerdos temporale illud administrare negotium: quia dicit quod spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem habet instituere ut sit, &c. Sed in præsumptione delinquant, quia et conjuges habet sacerdos instituere ut sint per solennitatem sacramenti, et judicare si boni non fuerint, non tamen administrare conjugale negotium si delinquant; nec potestas conjugalís secundum auctoritatem capitis a sacerdote dependet sed a Deo, immo nec ab aliqua potestate citra Christum."—Thom. Waldens. Doctrinal. Fid. Lib. II. Art. 3. cap. 78. [Tom. I. p. 392.]

and succour the other; not, as he saith, *ut utens potestate, sed fraternitatis accessu*: that is, "Not as having authority, or by virtue thereof presuming to do anything; but as one brother maketh haste to help another in danger, reaching forth the hand to stay him that is standing, and to raise him that is fallen." "Both the brethren," saith Waldensis, "both Simeon and Levi, priesthood and knighthood, bishoply power and that which is princely, must rise up together for the rescuing of Dinah their sister, out of the hands of him that seeketh to dishonour her:" *Vi charitatis etsi non auctoritatis*: that is, "By force of charity, though not of authority." So that, according to his opinion, the chief ministers of the Church invest the princes of the world with their royal authority, according to the saying of Hugo¹, but give them not their authority; they may judge of the actions of princes, but they may not *præjudicare*, they may not prejudice princes. They may in the time of need come to the succour, and in the time of danger reach forth the helping hand to the civil state, shaken by the negligence or malice of civil princes; but it must be by way of charity, not of authority: as likewise the civil state may, and ought to be assistant to the ecclesiastical in like danger, defect, or failing of the ecclesiastical ministers.

The next argument that our adversaries bring is taken from a comparison between the soul and body, expressing the difference between the civil and ecclesiastical state, found (as they say) in Gregory Nazianzen². But that we may the better understand the force of this argument, we must observe, that in the comparison which they bring, they make the ecclesiastical state and spiritual power like the spirit, and divine faculties thereof; and the civil state like the flesh, with the senses, and sensitive appetite thereof. And as in angels there is spirit without flesh, in brute beasts flesh and sense without spirit; and in man both these conjoined: so they will have us grant, that there is sometimes ecclesiastical power without civil, as

¹ Ubi supra.

² "Est igitur alia similitudo longe aptior in nobis ipsis qua hoc ipsum explicat Gregorius Nazianzenus... Ut enim se habent in homine spiritus et caro ita se habent in ecclesia duæ illæ potestates: nam caro et spiritus sunt quasi duæ respublicæ quæ et separatæ et conjunctæ inveniri possunt."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 6. [p. 439.]

in the apostles' times, and long after; sometimes civil without ecclesiastical, as among the heathen; and sometimes these two conjoined together. And as when the spirit and flesh meet in one, the spirit hath the command; and though it suffer the flesh to do all those things which it desireth unless they be contrary to the intendments, designs, and ends of it: yet when it findeth them to be contrary, it may and doth command the fleshly part to surcease from her own actions; yea, it maketh it to fast, watch, and do and suffer many grievous and afflictive things, even to the weakening of itself. So in like manner they would infer, that the ecclesiastical state being like to the spirit and soul, and the civil to the body of flesh, the Church hath power to restrain and bridle civil princes, if they hinder the spiritual good thereof, not only by censures ecclesiastical, but outward inforcement also. This is the great and grand argument our adversaries bring to prove that popes may depose princes: wherein first we may observe their folly, in that they bring similitudes, which serve only for illustration, and not for probation, for the main confirmation of one of the principal points of their faith: which whosoever denieth sinneth in as high a degree as Marcellinus, that sacrificed unto idols, and Peter, that denied his master¹. Secondly, we see how much princes are beholding unto them that compare them to brute beasts, and at the best, to the brutish part that is in men, common to them with brute beasts. If they say, Nazianzen so compareth them, they are like themselves, and speak untruly: for he compareth not princes and priests to spirit and flesh; but going about to show the difference of the objects of their power, maketh the spirit to be the object of the one of them, and the flesh of the other. Not as if princes were to take no care of the welfare of the souls of their subjects, as well as of their bodies, but because the immediate procuring of the soul's good is by preaching

¹ "Quamvis vel inopinata comprehensio, vel acerbitas persecutionis, vel senectutis imbecillitas, vel quid aliud in causa fuerit ut constantia titubaverit; confidimus tamen de Domini pietate, et de diuturna tua virtute, fore, ut qui S. Petri, et S. Marcellini casum aliqua ex parte imitatus videris, eorundem fortitudinem in reparandis viribus, et veritate asserenda feliciter imiteris."—Bellarm. Epist. ad Blackwellum. [In Respons. ad Apologiam pro Juramento Fidelitatis. Tom. v. p. 169.]

and ministration of the sacraments, and discipline, which the prince is to procure, and to see well performed, but not to administer these things himself; as also because the coactive power the prince hath extendeth only to the body, and not to the soul, as the ecclesiastical power of binding and loosing doth. Thirdly, we may observe, that if this similitude should prove any thing, it would prove that the civil state among Christians hath no power to do any act whatsoever but by the command or permission of the ecclesiastical. For so it is between the spirit and the body, and sensitive faculties, that show themselves in it. The philosophers note that there is a double regiment in man; the one political or civil, the other despotical; the one like the authority of princes over their subjects that are freemen, the other like the authority of lords over their bondmen and slaves. The former is of reason in respect of sensitive appetite, which by persuasion it may induce to surcease to desire that which it discerneth to be hurtful, but cannot force it so to do; the other of reason and the will, in respect of the locomotive faculty; and this absolute, so that if reason cannot win a desisting from desire in the inferior powers that show themselves in the body, yet the will may command the locomotive faculty, and either cause all outward action to cease, how earnestly soever sensitive desire carry unto it, or to be performed, how much soever it resist against it: as it may command and force the drinking of a bitter potion, which the appetite cannot be won unto, and the rejecting and putting from us those things that are most desired. Neither can the appetite and sensitive faculties perform any of their actions without the consent of the will and reason: for if the will command, the eyes are closed up and see nothing, the ears are stopped, and hear nothing, how much soever the appetite desire to see and hear. Neither only have the soul's higher powers this command over the inferior faculties, in respect of things that may further and hinder their own good and perfection, as they may command to watch or fast, for the prevention and mortification of sin; but they may also at their pleasure hinder the whole course of the actions of the outward man, withdraw all needful things from the body, and deprive it even of life itself, though there be no cause at all so to do. So that if the comparison of the civil and ecclesiastical state to the soul and body do hold, from

thence may it be inferred that the Church hath power to command in all things pertaining to the commonwealth, and that the civil magistrates have none at all. For the lower faculties neither have, nor ought to have, any command further than they are permitted by the superior; neither can they do any thing contrary to the liking of the superior, though never so just and reasonable. And so we see how silly a thing it is to reason from these similitudes, and that they that so do build upon the sands, so that all the frame of their building cometh to the ground.

The third reason brought by our adversaries is this: Every commonwealth must be perfect in itself, and able to defend itself from all injuries that any other may offer unto it, and if it can no other way free itself, it must have power to depose the prince, and change the government. Therefore the Church must be able to defend itself against all injuries of wicked kings, whether infidels, heretics, or apostates; and if otherwise it cannot defend itself from their violences and wrongs, it must have power to depose them. This consequence I think will never be found good in the judgment of any indifferent reader. For the kingdoms and commonwealths of the world, the good, prosperity and happiness whereof is outward, must have outward means to repress the insolencies of all such as seek to impeach or hinder the same; but the Church being a society, the happiness and good whereof is not outward, but inward, consisting in the graces of God, and the hope of a better life in the world to come, may be perfect in itself, though it want means to repress outward violences and insolencies: the apostle himself, who was a chief commander in it, professing that the weapons¹ of his warfare were not carnal, but mighty through God for the casting down of proud thoughts, but not for the overthrow of cities and towns, or the subduing of the princes of the world. So that the perfection of this society or commonwealth standing in the inward graces of the spirit, and the expectation of future happiness, she may attain her own end, enjoy her own good, and flourish in the midst of all pressures, more than in any state of outward prosperity; and so undoubtedly she doth. For as the gold is more pure the more it is tried in the fire; as the camomile smelleth the sweeter the more it is

¹ 2 Cor. x. 4.

trodden on; as the palm-tree spreadeth the further the more it is pressed down; as the ark of Noe rose the higher the more the floods did swell: so God's Church did then most grow, increase and prosper, when the persecutions were hottest. And therefore S. Austin¹ saith (speaking of the primitive Christians) *Includebantur, ligabantur, torquebantur, trucidabantur, et multiplicabantur*; that is, "they were shut up in prisons and dungeons, they were bound in fetters and chains, they were tortured and racked, yea, they were slain with the sword, and yet they increased and multiplied." And S. Bernard², distinguishing three several times of the Church, in all which she complained of bitterness; the first under persecuting heathen emperors, the second in the conflicts with heretics, and the third when she had rest from both these; saith, the state of the Church was worst in her peace; and bringeth her in complaining and saying: *Amarissima amaritudo mea in pace mea*; that is, "My bitterness is most bitter in the days of my peace. For now," *omnes amici, omnes inimici, omnes domestici, nulli pacifici; servi Christi serviunt antichristo*: that is, "all are friends, and all are enemies; all are of my household, but none are at peace with me; the servants of Christ serve antichrist." So that it followeth not, that if the Church must have means to attain her own end, and enjoy her own wished good, that she must have power sufficient to procure her outward peace, and repress the insolencies of outward enemies. And yet besides, this reason chargeth Christ with want of care of his Church, who left it without means to defend itself against outward violence for the space of three hundred years together, during the time of the heathen emperors, and afterwards also under the reign of apostates and heretics. For Bellarmine saith³, that the primitive Christians did not depose Nero, Dioclesian, Julian the apostata, Valens the Arian, and other like, because they wanted temporal forces.

The next reason is more strange than this. For, first,

¹ August. De Civ. Dei. [Vid. Lib. i. cap. 10. Tom. vii. col. 11; et Lib. xviii. cap. 50. col. 532.]

² Serm. xxxiii. in Cantica. [Tom. i. col. 1397. Par. 1719.]

³ "Quod si Christiani olim non deposuerunt Neronem, et Diocletianum, et Julianum apostatam, ac Valentem Arianum, et similes, id fuit quia deerant vires temporales."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 7. [Tom. i. p. 441.]

forgetting what they are to prove, instead of proving that the pope may depose princes, they endeavour to prove that the people may depose princes when they fall into heresy, and that the pope is to judge of heresy. Secondly, they conclude that Christian people may not endure their king if he fall into heresy, because they may not choose a king that is an infidel or heretic. That they might not choose an heretic (which no man denieth) they prove, because the Jews¹ might choose none to be their king that was not of their brethren, lest he should draw them to idolatry. But the consequence they go not about to prove, which we deny, and they will never be able to confirm. For there is no question but people are bound to be subject to such a king as in conscience they might not choose if they were free and to make choice. When Moses² was counselled by Jethro to choose elders and rulers to assist him, he told him what manner of men they should be, to wit, men fearing God, dealing truly, hating covetousness: and none but such ought electors, having freedom of choice, to choose: and yet I think, though a king be covetous, he is not presently to be deposed. And therefore Bellarmine³ (like an honest man) confuteth his own argument, and saith, that infidels that had dominion over people before they became Christians, are to be tolerated by Christians, if they seek not to draw them to idolatry; whom yet I think Christians might not choose to reign over them if they were free. Besides this, if Bellarmine say true, that

¹ Deut. xvii. 15, 16.

² Exod. xviii. 21.

³ "Tertia ratio. Non licet Christianis tolerare regem infidelem aut hæreticum, si ille conetur pertrahere subditos ad suam hæresim, vel infidelitatem; at judicare an rex pertrahat ad hæresim necne, pertinet ad pontificem, cui est commissa cura religionis; ergo pontificis est judicare regem esse deponendum, vel non deponendum. Probatur hujus argumenti propositio ex cap. 17. Deut. ubi prohibetur populus eligere regem qui non sit de fratribus suis, id est, non Judæum; ne videlicet pertrahat Judæos ad idololatriam. Ergo etiam Christiani prohibentur eligere regem non Christianum, nam illud præceptum morale est, et naturali æquitate nititur. Rursum ejusdem periculi et damni est eligere non Christianum, et non deponere non Christianum, ut notum est: ergo tenentur Christiani non pati super se regem non Christianum, si ille conetur avertere populum a fide. Addo istam conditionem propter eos principes infideles qui habuerunt dominium supra populum suum antequam populus converteretur ad fidem: si enim tales principes non conentur fideles a fide avertere, non existimo eos posse privari suo dominio."—[Ubi supra.]

subjects sin as much in tolerating kings that are infidels, apostates, or heretics, as in choosing such to rule over them when they were free, all the primitive Christians that tolerated Nero, Dioclesian, Julian the apostata, Constantius, Valens, and other heretics, sinned damnably in so doing. Neither will Bellarmine's answer that they are to be excused, though they did not depose them, because they wanted strength, avoid the same. For it is evident by Tertullian, that they wanted not strength if they had thought it lawful. "If we should go about to avenge ourselves," saith Tertullian¹, "we should not want means. For behold, we are more in number, and greater in strength, than any one nation and people of the world. We are strangers unto you, and yet, behold, we have filled all places pertaining unto you, your cities, your isles, your villages, your towns, your council-houses, your castles, and strong forts, your palaces, your senates, and your market-places; only your idol-temples we have left free unto you. What war should we not be able to take in hand? or what attempt should seem hard unto us? though we were too weak who so willingly are slain, if it were not more lawful to be killed than to kill in our profession. Nay, though we should never arm ourselves, nor lift up our hands against you, but only depart away, and withdraw ourselves into some remote parts of the world, how should we confound and amaze you? How could you endure so great a loss? How would your cities be left desolate, and none found to dwell in them!" So that it was not want of strength that held the primitive Christians in subjection to their heathen and persecuting emperors, but the persuasion

¹ "Si et hostes exertos, non tantum vindices occultos agere vellemus, deesset nobis vis numerorum et copiarum? Plures nimirum Mauri, et Marcomanni, ipsique Parthi, vel quantæcunque unius tamen loci et suorum finium gentes quam totius orbis. Hesterni sumus, et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum, sola vobis relinquimus templa. Cui bello non idonei, non prompti fuisset, etiam impares copiis, qui tam libenter trucidamur, si non apud istam disciplinam magis occidi liceret, quam occidere? Potuimus et inermes, nec rebelles, sed tantummodo discordes, solius divortii invidia adversus vos dimicasse. Si enim tanta vis hominum in aliquem orbis remoti sinum abrupissemus a vobis, suffudisset utique dominationem vestram tot qualiumcumque amissio civium, immo etiam et ipsa destitutione punisset."—Tertull. Apolog. Advers. Gent. cap. 37. [p. 30. Par. 1675.]

they had, that it was their duty so to be subject, persuading themselves they had their power from heaven: and therefore, *Illuc suspicientes*, saith Tertullian¹, *manibus expansis, quia innocuis, capite nudo quia non erubescimus; denique sine monitore, quia de pectore oramus precantes sumus omnes semper pro omnibus imperatoribus, vitam illis prolixam, imperium securum, domum tutam, exercitus fortes, senatum fidelem, populum probum, orbem quietum et quæcunque hominis et Cæsaris sunt vota*: that is, "Looking up thither, with hands lifted up and spread out, because innocent, with bare heads, because we are not ashamed, and without a remembrancer, because our prayers proceed from the desires that lodge within in our breast, we all pray always for all emperors and rulers, desiring God to grant unto them a long life, a secure reign, a safe house, valiant armies, a faithful senate, good people, a quiet world; and all the good things that the heart either of a private man or of Cæsar can desire." O silly erring Christians, durst you pray for the prosperity of them whom you should have persecuted with fire and sword, and utterly have destroyed? But it is not to be marvelled at if you thus erred; for you were Christians, and had no Jesuits among you, from whom these mysteries of deposing princes might have been learned: so that we may hope that ignorance did excuse you, and that ye are not gone to hell for this neglecting of your duty. But some man perhaps will say, Tertullian might be deceived in this point. Let us hear therefore whether others were of his mind or not. *Julianus imperator*, saith Ambrose², *quamvis esset apostata, habuit tamen sub se Christianos milites, quibus cum dicebat, producite aciem pro defensione reipublicæ, obediebant ei: cum autem diceret eis, producite arma in Christianos, tunc cognoscebant imperatorem cæli*: that is, "Julian the emperor, though he were an apostate, yet had under him Christian soldiers, who when he said unto them, Bring forth your armies for the defence of the commonwealth, willingly obeyed him: but when he said unto them, Bring forth your forces, and fight against the Christians, took knowledge of the Emperor in heaven, and not of him." And St Augustine saith to the same

¹ Ibid. cap. 30. [p. 27.]

² Citat. a Gratian. Decret. Part. II. Caus. XI. Quæst. 3. cap. 54. [col. 1037.]

purpose¹, that Julian the emperor was an infidel, an apostate, a wicked man, and an idolater; and yet there were Christian soldiers that served this unbelieving emperor, when they came to the cause of Christ they acknowledged none other Emperor but him only whose throne is in heaven. When he required them to worship idols, or to burn incense, they preferred God before him. When he said, Bring forth your armies, and go against such a nation, they presently obeyed him; so did they wisely distinguish between the eternal and temporal lord, and yet they were subject to the temporal lord for the eternal Lord's sake. Neither was this the private conceit of these men alone, but all other the worthy fathers and bishops of the Church were of the same mind, and persuaded themselves that they owed all duty to kings and emperors, though they were heretics or infidels. And therefore Athanasius (when some charged him that he had spoken evil of Constantius the Arian heretic to Constance his brother, and sought to make variance between them), in his Apology to Constantius², calleth God to witness against his own soul that he had never done any such thing; and telleth the emperor, he was not mad, nor had not forgotten the saying of the wise man, "Curse not the king in thy secret thought, and speak not evil of the rich and mighty in the retired places of thy chamber. For the fowls of heaven will carry forth thy voice, and that that hath wings will make report of thy words³."

The fifth reason that they bring to prove that Christians may depose misbelieving emperors and kings, if they have means so to do, is, because the apostle willeth⁴ the Corinthians

¹ "Julianus exstitit infidelis imperator. Nonne exstitit apostata iniquus, idolatra? Milites Christiani servierunt imperatori infideli. Ubi veniebant ad causam Christi, non agnoscebant nisi illum qui in cœlo erat. Quando volebat ut idola colerent, ut thurificarent, præponebant illi Deum. Quando autem dicebat producite aciem, ite contra illam gentem, statim obtemperabant. Distinguebant dominium æternum a dominio temporali: et tamen subditi erant propter dominum æternum etiam domino temporali."—August. Apud. Gratian. Decret. Part. II. Caus. XI. Quæst. 3. cap. 98. [col. 1039.]

² "Οὐδὲ τηλικούτος ἦμην ἐγὼ, ἵνα περὶ τοιούτων ἐκοινολογούμεθα, καὶ ἀδελφὸν ἀδελφῷ διέβαλλον, ἢ παρὰ βασιλεῖ περὶ βασιλέως κακῶς μνημονεύσω. Οὐ μαίνομαι, βασιλεῦ, οὐδὲ ἐπελαθόμην τῆς θείας φωνῆς, λεγούσης, κ.τ.λ."—Athanas. Apolog. ad regem Constant. [Tom. I. p. 296.]

³ Eccles. x. 20.

⁴ 1 Cor. vi. 4.

that were become Christians to appoint new judges of their controversies about temporal affairs and businesses, that they might not be forced to bring their pleas before heathen magistrates that were their enemies, to the scorn of their profession¹: which is so silly a reason, that I cannot persuade myself they propose it in earnest, but only for fashion's sake, to help to make up a number. For they know right well these judges the apostle speaketh of were but only arbitrators chosen by the agreement of the parties, and not absolute rulers over them, with abrogation of the magistracy of those heathen rulers, to whom they were subject; and therefore notwithstanding anything the apostle writeth, there were three cases wherein the faithful and believing Corinthians might come before the heathen judges². The first, if the infidels, in the controversies they had with them about secular things, drew them thither. The second, if a believer being contentious, drew them to those tribunals, refusing to have things determined otherwise. The third, if the believer had none other means to recover his right, which he was bound in conscience to recover and preserve; for in such a case he might become a plaintiff before heathen magistrates.

"But," saith Bellarmine³, "the believing husband, whose wife being an infidel will not dwell with him without con-

¹ "Quod alioqui jure potuissent id facere [scil. deponere Neronem, &c.] patet ex apostolo 1 Cor. vi. ubi jubet constitui novos judices a Christianis temporalium caussarum, ne cogereantur Christiani caussam dicere coram judice Christi persecutore: sicut enim novi judices constitui potuerunt, ita et novi principes et reges propter eandem caussam, si vires adfuissent."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

² "In tribus casibus poterant fideles Corinthii apud infidelem licite judicium expostulare. Primus est, si infideles in casibus in quibus erant subjecti ipsos ad judicium infidelium protrahebant. Secundus, si reus fidelis coactus ab actore fideli, licet iniquo in hoc, in judicium infidelium trahebatur. Tertius, si actor tenebatur acquirere jus suum, quod non potest nisi per judices infideles solummodo obtinere."—Ockam. Super Potest. et Dignit. Papali. Quæst. 1. Cap. 11. [Apud Goldast. Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp. Tom. II. p. 327.]

³ "Cur non potest liberari populus fidelis a jugo regis infidelis et pertrahentis ad infidelitatem, si conjunx fidelis liber est ab obligatione manendi cum conjuge infideli, quando ille non vult manere cum conjuge Christiana sine injuria fidei.... Non enim minor est potestas conjugis in conjugem, quam regis in subditos, sed aliquanto etiam major."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

tinual blaspheming of God the Creator, and soliciting him to infidelity and apostasy, is freed from his wife; and likewise the believing wife from her unbelieving husband, so continuing to blaspheme Christ, and to solicit her to idolatry; therefore by like reason the believing people are freed from the yoke of an unbelieving king seeking to draw them to infidelity." This argument drawn from comparison faileth many ways. For first, according to Bellarmine's opinion¹, the believing party is free from the other remaining in infidelity, though the infidel do neither depart, nor solicit, or persuade to idolatry, if there be not a present conversion: so that the believer may dismiss his wife which he married in infidelity, if she continue an infidel, though she neither depart from him, nor seek to win him to infidelity. But touching a king who is an unbeliever, he thinketh (though Thomas² be of another opinion) that the people converting to Christianity cannot shake off his yoke, unless he seek to draw them back to infidelity; and therefore all that is not lawful to the people, in respect of an unbelieving king, that is lawful to the husband, in respect of his unbelieving wife, or to the wife, in respect of her unbelieving husband. Secondly, this comparison, if it prove any thing, mainly overthroweth the opinion of Bellarmine. For if the husband and the wife were Christians when they were married, and afterwards one of them fall into heresy, apostasy, atheism, or whatsoever else, and seek never so violently to draw the right believer to the same evils, yet the bond of marriage remaineth inviolable, and is not, nor may not be dissolved: and therefore if this comparison hold, a Christian king falling into heresy, apostasy, or atheism, and seeking to draw his people to the same, doth not lose the right of dominion he hath over them. Thirdly, in Bellarmine's opinion it is not refusal to dwell together, nor solicitation to idolatry, that could make a separation, if the band of matrimony contracted between infidels were simply firm and indissoluble, as that of Christians is. But heathen princes have as

¹ "Si infidelis non deserat fidelem, sed velit ei cohabitare cum injuria creatoris, perpetuo scilicet persuadendo reditum ad infidelitatem et Christum blasphemando, certe poterit a fidei dimitti."—Bellarm. De Matrim. Sacram. Lib. i. cap. 12. [Tom. III. p. 642.]

² "Si tales principes non conentur fideles a fide avertere, non existimo posse eos privari suo dominio. Quanquam contrarium sentit B. Thomas in 2. 2. quæst. 10. art. 10."—Bellarm. [ubi supra.]

good interest in their kingdoms (which are not founded upon grace or faith, but upon the light of reason, the freedom of will, and the law of nature and nations,) as believers: therefore their soliciting to infidelity and idolatry cannot make their titles to their kingdom void. Lastly, malicious desertion or refusal to dwell with the believer, unless he some way at least by silence consent to the blasphemies of the infidel, is directly contrary to the nature, essence, end, and intendment of marriage, and therefore dissolveth marriage; but the abuse of sacred authority to the promoting of impiety, and suppressing of true religion, is not contrary to the nature and essence of authority, but to the right use of it; and therefore it doth not make void the title of magistrates, seeing it is certain that lawful authority may stand with most horrible abuse of the same.

Wherefore let us proceed to their seventh proof. "When princes," say they¹, "come to the Church, and are admitted to the communion of the faithful people of God, they are not admitted but upon promise and agreement, that if they forsake the faith, or hinder the good of God's people, they will be content, and it shall be lawful for the governors of the Church to take their authority from them; therefore when princes become heretics or apostates, it is lawful, by their own agreement and consent, for the governors of the Church to depose them." The antecedent of this argument, I think, will never be made good. For what prince in his admission to be a Christian did ever thus condition with the Church, either expressly, or by necessary implication? examples of any such stipulation, I am persuaded they can bring us none. It is true, indeed, that the very vow of a Christian made in baptism implieth in it a resolution and promise, rather to depart with any thing, and lose all, than to forfeit the inheritance he is entitled unto, to dishonour God, or any way to hinder the good of his Church: but this vow and promise is made to God, and not to the Church; and therefore God may take

¹ "Quarto ratio. Quando reges et principes ad ecclesiam veniunt ut Christiani fiant, recipiuntur cum pacto expresse, vel tacito, ut sceptrum suum subiciant Christo, et polliceantur se Christi fidem servaturos et defensuros, etiam sub poena regni perdendi; ergo quando fiunt hæretici, aut religioni obsunt, possunt ab ecclesia judicari, et etiam deponi a principatu, nec ulla eis injuria fiet, si deponantur."—Bellarm. [Ibid.]

from Christian kings their kingdoms, when they become heretics, and seek to mislead the people, as forfeited upon their own agreements; but the Church hath nothing to do with them, more than the great Turk, upon any such forfeiture made unto Almighty God. It is true, that all infidels, and wicked ones, have forfeited their kingdoms to God; but yet in the title of mundane justice they have right to them still, and may not be dispossessed of them by mortal men, unless they be specially authorised by Almighty God, as the Israelites were to cast out the Canaanites. And this was the meaning of Wickliffe, when he affirmed, that a prince being in state of mortal sin, ceaseth to be a prince any longer, namely in respect of any title he can plead to God, if he be pleased to take the advantage of the forfeiture; but in respect of men, he hath a good title still, in the course of mundane justice. So that whosoever shall lift up his hand against him offereth him wrong. The Church therefore may proceed no further than to admonish princes, when they offend, and for grievous and scandalous faults to deny unto them the benefit of her communion.

The last proof they bring for deposing princes, when they become heretics, is taken from the office of a pastor¹, to whom it pertaineth to drive away wolves, to restrain and keep the rams, and great leaders of the flocks, from hurting those sheep that are more weak. This reason, as it is last, so it is the worst of all. For each pastor must do these things according to the nature and quality of his pastoral office, and therefore a spiritual pastor must perform them by spiritual and ecclesiastical censures, driving away the wolves from his flocks, by suspension, excommunication, and anathema, and restraining the rams from hurting the rest by the same means, so binding them with bands that exceed all the bands of restraint used by the secular powers.

¹ "Quinta ratio. Cum Petro dictum est, 'Pasce oves,' data est illi facultas omnis, quæ est pastori necessaria ad gregem tuendam. At pastori necessaria est potestas triplex, nimirum, una circa lupos, ut eos arceat omni ratione qua poterit; altera circa arietes, ut si quando cornibus lædant gregem, possit eos recludere et prohibere, ne gregem ulterius præcedant; tertia circa oves reliquas, ut singulis tribuat convenientia pabula; ergo hanc triplicem potestatem habet summus pontifex."—[Bellarm. Ibid.]

CHAPTER XLVI.

OF EXAMPLES OF CHURCHMEN DEPOSING PRINCES, BROUGHT
BY THE ROMANISTS.

HAVING examined the reasons brought to prove that the chief governors of the Church may depose princes erring from the faith, and hindering the course of religion; let us see what examples our adversaries produce of the practice of deposing them. The first is the example of Samuel¹ appointing Saul to be a king, and afterwards² deposing him for his disobedience. But in this example they are grossly deceived. For first, Samuel was neither high priest, nor priest at all, not being of the posterity of Aaron. Secondly, Samuel did not appoint Saul to be king, as being of higher authority, but as obeying and executing the mandate of God, as the meanest man in Israel might have done; as we read in the second of the Kings³, of one of the sons of the prophets, who at the commandment of Elizeus anointed Jehu king over Israel, yet was neither Elizeus nor he greater in dignity than kings. Thirdly, we do not read in the sacred history that Samuel deposed Saul, but that God deposed him, and that Samuel was the messenger sent from God to let him know it. "Because," saith Samuel, "thou hast cast away the word of the Lord, the Lord hath cast thee away that thou shalt not reign." And again, "The Lord hath cut away the kingdom of Israel from thee this day." Yea so far was Samuel from deposing Saul, that he mourned for him, till God blamed him, saying, "How long dost thou mourn for Saul? whereas I have cast him away that he should not reign over Israel⁴."

The next example is that of Hieremy the prophet, to whom the Lord said, "I have set thee over nations and people, to pluck up, and to root out, and to destroy, and throw down, to build and to plant⁵." Whence they infer that the chief priest is over the kingdoms of the world, and may give them to whom he will. But first, we must observe that Hieremy was not the high priest, but one of an inferior rank;

¹ 1 Sam. ix.

² 1 Sam. xv. 23.

³ 2 Kings ix. 1.

⁴ 1 Sam. xvi. 1.

⁵ Jerem. i. 10.

and that therefore, if we will conclude anything from hence touching the power of disposing kingdoms by priests, every priest must have this power. Secondly, we must know that Hieremy was set over the kingdom of Judah and other kingdoms, not to rule them, but prophetically to denounce unto them and foreshow the things that afterwards should fall out. Whereupon Lyra interpreteth the words of Almighty God in this sort¹: *Constitui te super gentes, et super regna, ut evellas, id est, evellendo denuncies, transferendos inde habitatores; et destruas, quantum ad occidendos; et disperdas, quantum ad fugientes per diversas vias; et dissipas, quantum ad morientes in fuga vel captivitate; et ædifices et plantes, id est, denuncies Judæos reædificandos, et plantandos in terra sua, &c.*: that is, “I have set thee over nations, and kingdoms, that thou mightest pluck up; that is, that thou mightest denounce and foreshow, that the inhabitants being plucked up out of their places, shall be carried into another place. That thou mayest destroy; that is, denounce the destruction of such as shall be slain. That thou mayest scatter; that is, denounce and foreshow the dispersion of such as shall fly divers ways. That thou mayest overthrow; that is, declare and foreshow the overthrow of them that shall die in flight or in captivity. That thou mayest build and plant; that is, foreshow, that the Jews shall be builded and planted again in their own land;” which was fulfilled in the time of Cyrus, who gave liberty to the people to return into their own country, and to re-edify the temple; and in the time of Artaxerxes, who gave leave to Nehemiah to re-edify the city of Jerusalem, as we may read in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The author of the interlineal Gloss interpreteth the words in this sense: that the prophet was appointed by Almighty God over kingdoms and people, to pluck up vices and sins, to destroy the kingdom of the devil, and to build the Church of God. Saint Hierome likewise interpreteth the words in the same sort: *Considerandum est, saith he², quod quatuor tristibus duo læta succedant. Neque enim ædificari poterant bona, nisi destructa essent mala; nec plantari optima, nisi eradicarentur pessima, &c.*: that is, “We must consider that two joyful and happy things succeed four grievous and sorrowful things. For

¹ Lyra in hunc locum. [Tom. iv. col. 568. Antv. 1634.]

² Hieronym. in eundem locum. [Tom. iv. col. 839.]

neither could good things be builded, if evil things were not first destroyed; nor the best things be planted, if the worst things were not first plucked up by the roots. For every plant which our heavenly Father hath not planted shall be plucked up by the roots. And every building which hath not a foundation upon the Rock, but is builded upon the sand, is digged down and destroyed by the word of God; and Jesus shall consume it by the spirit of his mouth, and destroy it by the coming of his presence; that is, he shall destroy for ever all sacrilegious and perverse doctrine, and that also which is lifted up against the knowledge of God, and the confidence that men have in their own wisdom he shall scatter, destroy, and cast down; that, instead of these things, the things that savour of humility may be builded; and the things which agree with ecclesiastical verity may be builded and planted in the place of the former things, which were destroyed and plucked up." Here is pulling up of all false doctrine, and throwing down whatsoever is lifted up against the knowledge of God, that those things that savour of humility, and are agreeable to ecclesiastical verity, may be builded and planted. And thus to pluck up and to plant, to cast down and to build up, pertaineth to Hieremie's office and calling; but for deposing of kings, and transferring kingdoms, no ancient writer could ever find anything in this place.

The third example that they produce is that of Uzziah¹, who after much prosperity in all that he took in hand, and many glorious victories obtained, not contenting himself with the honour of a king, but presuming to come into the temple to offer incense, and intruding upon the priest's office also, was by them resisted, and told it would be displeasing to Almighty God that he did. But he waxing angry would not desist, till being stricken with leprosy, and the very earth trembling and quaking for horror of so vile a fact, he was by the priests and the remorse of his own conscience forced to go hastily out of the temple. This leprosy departed not from him till his dying day, and therefore he was by virtue of God's law constrained to depart from the society of men, and to dwell apart; and Jotham his son ruled over the king's house, and judged the people of the land. How this place will prove that the deposing of kings belongeth to priests, I know not, for surely

¹ 2 Chron. xxvi.

Uzziah was not deposed, but being forced to live in an house apart by himself, and in that respect unfit for the government, his son supplied his place in judging the people of the land : but he continued king still ; and if he had been cleansed from his leprosy before his death, no doubt, might, and would have resumed his kingly dignity, and the public administration of justice. Whereupon we shall find that Jotham is said to have reigned no more but sixteen¹ years, because after his father's death in his own right he reigned no more : though otherwise we find mention of things that fell out in the twentieth² year of his reign ; so including the time of his ruling for his father in his right. So that here was nothing done by the priests but that which pertained to their priestly office, which was to keep the holy places, and attend the altars, and to judge of the plague of leprosy : but for deposing the king they meddled not.

The fourth example is of Jehoiada the high priest deposing Athaliah, and setting up Joash, as they tell us. The story is this. Jehosaphat³ dieth, and Jehoram his son succeedeth him. This Jehoram marrieth Athaliah the daughter of Ahab, the son of Omri ; and he walked not in the ways of Jehosaphat and Asa kings of Judah, but of wicked Ahab, whose daughter he married. Whereupon God stirred up the spirit of the Philistines, and Arabians, and they came and took away all the substance that was found in his house, and his wives and sons, so that none was left him, but Jehoahaz or Ahaziah his youngest son. After this Jehoram dieth, and Ahaziah reigneth in his stead, who followed the counsel of Athaliah, and did wickedly in the sight of the Lord. This Ahaziah going to Jehoram the son of Ahab, and being found with him when Jehu came to execute judgment against the house of Ahab, was there slain by Jehu. After his death, Athaliah his mother destroyed all the king's seed of the house of Judah, and usurped the kingdon ; but Jehoshebeath, the wife of Jehoiada the priest, sister to Ahaziah, stole away Joash the king's son, from among the king's sons, that he should not be slain ; and he was hid in the house of God six years, all which time Athaliah reigned. But in the seventh year Jehoiada waxed bold, took the captains of hundreds in covenant with him, and

¹ 2 Kings xv. 33.

² 2 Kings xv. 30.

³ 2 Chron. xxi, xxii, xxiii.

went about in Judah, and gathered the Levites out of all the cities of Judah, and the chief fathers of Israel; and they came to Jerusalem; and all the congregation made a covenant with the king, and said, The king's son must reign, as the Lord hath said of the sons of David. Hereupon the king is proclaimed, Athaliah is slain, the house of Baal destroyed, and the altars and idols that were in it broken down. In all this narration there is nothing that maketh for the chief priest's power of deposing lawful kings, if they become heretics. For first, Athaliah was an usurper, and no lawful queen. Secondly, here was nothing done by Jehoiada alone, but by him and the captains of hundreds, and the chief fathers of Israel, that entered into covenant with him. Thirdly, there is great difference between the high priest in the time of the law, and in the time of Christ. For before the coming of Christ, the high priest even in the managing of the weightiest civil affairs, and in judgment of life and death, sat in the council of state, as the second person next unto the king, by God's own appointment. Whereas our adversaries dare not claim any such thing for the pope. And therefore it is not to be marvelled at, if the high priest, being the second person in the kingdom of Judah, by God's own appointment, and the uncle and protector of the young king, whom his wife had saved from destruction, be the first mover for the bringing of him to his right; and when things are resolved on by common consent, take on him not only to command and direct the priests and Levites, but the captains and soldiers also, for the establishing of their king, and the suppressing of a bloody tyrant and usurper. For all this might be done by Jehoiada, as a chief man in that state, and yet the pope be so far from obtaining that he claimeth (which is to depose lawful kings for abusing their authority), that he may not presume to do all that the high priests lawfully did, and might do; as not having so great pre-eminence from Christ, in respect of matters of civil state in any kingdom of the world, as the high priest had by God's own appointment in the kingdom of Judah and Israel. "In the old law," saith Occam¹, "the high priest meddled in

¹ "Sicut in veteri lege summus sacerdos armis, bellis, necibus hominum, truncationibus membrorum, vindictæ sanguinis, immiscuit se decenter; ita etiam deceret, ut summus sacerdos novæ legis se hujusmodi implicaret; quæ tamen omnia et similia absurda sunt,

the matters of war, in the judgment of life and death, and the loss of members, and vengeance of blood, &c.: it beseemed him well so to do: but the priests of the new law may not meddle with things of this nature. Wherefore, from the power and dominion which the high priest of the old law had, it cannot be concluded that the pope hath any power in temporal matters."

The fifth example is of Ambrose repelling Theodosius the emperor from the communion of the Church, after the bloody and horrible murder that was committed at Thessalonica by his commandment. The story is this¹: The coachman of Botherica, the captain of the soldiers in that town, for some fault was committed to prison. Now when the solemn horse-race and sporting fight of horsemen approached, the people of Thessalonica desired to have him set at liberty, as one of whom there would be great use in those ensuing solemn sports; which being denied, the city was in an uproar, and Botherica, and certain other of the magistrates, were stoned to death, and most despitefully used. Theodosius the emperor, hearing of this outrage, was exceedingly moved, and commanded a certain number to be put to the sword, without all judicial form of proceeding, or putting difference between offenders and such as were innocent. So that seven thousand perished by the sword, and among them many strangers (that were come into the city upon divers occasions, that had no part in the outrage for which Theodosius was so sore displeased,) were most cruelly and unjustly slain. St Ambrose understanding of this violent and unjust proceeding of the emperor, the next time he came to Milan, and was coming to the church, after his wonted manner, met him at the door, and stayed him from entering with this speech: "Thou seemest not to know, O emperor, what horrible and bloody murders have been committed by thee; neither dost thou bethink thyself, now thy rage is past, to what extremities thy fury carried thee: perhaps the glory

censenda: quamobrem ex potestate et dominio quod habuit in temporalibus summus sacerdos veteris legis, concludi non potest quod papa in temporalibus aliquam habeat potestatem."—Ockam. *De Potest. et Dignit. Papal.* Quæst. 1. cap. 11. [Apud Goldast. *Monarch. Sacr. Rom. Imp.* Tom. II. p. 325.]

¹ Vid. Sozomen. *H. E. Lib. VII. cap. 24.* Theodoret. *H. E. Lib. V. cap. 17 et 18.*

of thine imperial power will not let thee take notice of any fault, and thy greatness repelleth all check of reason controlling thee: but thou shouldest know the frailty of man's nature, and that the dust was that beginning whence we are taken, and to which we must return. Let not therefore the glory of thy purple robes make thee forget the weakness of that body of flesh that is covered with them: thy subjects, O emperor, are in nature like thee, and in service thy fellows; for there is one Lord and commander over all, the Maker of all things. Wherefore with what eyes wilt thou behold his temple, or with what feet wilt thou tread on the sacred pavement thereof? wilt thou lift up to him those hands from which the blood yet droppeth? wilt thou receive with them the sacred body of our Lord? or wilt thou presume to put to thy mouth the cup replenished with the precious blood of Christ, which hast shed so much innocent blood by the word of thy mouth, uttering the passion of thy furious mind? Depart therefore, add not this iniquity to the rest, and decline not those bands which God above approveth." With these speeches the emperor was much moved; and knowing the distinct duties both of emperors and bishops (for that he had been trained up in the knowledge of heavenly doctrine), returned to the court with tears and sighs. A long time after (for eight months were first past), the solemn feast of the Nativity of Christ approached, and all prepared themselves to solemnize the same with triumphant joy. But the emperor sat in the court, lamenting and pouring down rivers of tears; which when Ruffinus, master of the palace, perceived, he came unto him, and asked the cause of his weeping: to whom (weeping more bitterly than before) he said, "O Ruffinus, thou makest but a sport of these things, for thou art touched with no sense of those evils wherewith I am afflicted, but the consideration of my calamity maketh me sigh and lament: for that whereas the doors of God's temple are open to slaves and beggars, and they go freely into the same to make prayers unto their Lord, they are shut against me; and, which is yet worse, the gates of heaven are shut against me also; for I cannot forget the words of our Lord, who saith, 'Whomsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven.'" To whom Ruffinus replied, "I will run, if it please thee, O emperor, to the bishop, and intreat him to unloose these bands wherewith he hath bound

thee." "No," saith the emperor; "it is to no purpose so to do, for he will not be entreated. I know his sentence is right and just, and that he will not transgress the law of God for any respect of imperial power." Yet when Ruffinus was earnest, and promised confidently to pacify Ambrose, he bade him go with speed, and himself followed after in hope of reconciliation, trusting upon the promises of Ruffinus. But when Ambrose saw Ruffinus, he said unto him: "O Ruffinus, thou dost imitate the impudency of shameless dogs; for having been the adviser and counsellor to so vile murders, thou hast hardened thy forehead, and having cast away all shame, blushest not, after the committing of so great and horrible outrages against men made after the image of God." And when he was importunate with him, and told him the emperor was coming, full of fiery zeal, he brake forth into these words: "I tell thee, Ruffinus, I will not suffer him to pass the thresholds of God's house; and if of an emperor he become a tyrant, I will joyfully suffer death." Whereupon Ruffinus caused one to run to the emperor, and to desire him to stay within the court. But the emperor being on the way when the messenger met him, resolved to come forward, and to endure the reproof of the bishop. So he came to the sacred rails, but entered not into the temple; and coming to the bishop, besought him to unloose him from the bands wherewith he was bound. The bishop, somewhat offended with his coming, told him, the manner of his coming was tyrant-like, and that being mad against God, he trampled under his feet the laws of God. "Not so," said the emperor; "I press not hither in despite of order, neither do I unjustly strive to enter into the house of God. But, I beseech thee, to unloose me, to remember the merciful disposition of our common Lord, and not to shut the door against me, that he would have opened to all that repent." "What repentance therefore," saith the bishop, "hast thou showed, after so grievous an offence? what medicines hast thou applied to cure thy wounds?" "It pertaineth to thee," saith the emperor, "to prepare the medicines that should heal me, and to cure my wounds; and to me, to use that thou prescribest." "Then," said Ambrose, "seeing thou makest thy displeasure judge, and it is not reason that giveth sentence, when thou sittest upon the throne to do right, but thy furious proceedings; make a law, that when sentence of death and confiscation

of goods shall be passed, there may pass thirty days before the execution of the same, that so, if within that space it be found unjust, it may be reversed; or otherwise, it may proceed." This law the emperor most willingly consented to make, and thereupon Ambrose unloosed him from his bands; and he entered into the temple, and prayed unto God, not standing, nor kneeling, but prostrate upon the earth, and passionately uttering these words of David: "My soul cleaveth to the pavement; Lord, quicken me according to thy word¹." Here we see an excellent pattern of a good bishop, and a good emperor; and it is hard to say, whether Ambrose were more to be commended for his zeal, magnanimous resolution, and constancy, or the emperor for his willing and submissive obedience. But of deposing princes here is nothing; Ambrose being so far from any thought of lifting up his hand against the emperor, that he resolved to subject himself unto him, even to the suffering of martyrdom, if need should require. "But," saith Bellarmine, "Ambrose exercised civil authority, in that he took notice of this murder of the emperor, being a criminal cause, and forced him to make a civil law, for the preventing of furious and bloody proceedings in judgment." This surely is a weak collection: for the Church hath power, by virtue of her ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to take notice of such horrible crimes as murder, and to punish them with spiritual punishments. Neither was the inducing of Theodosius to make a civil law for the preventing of such like evils as he was now censured for, before he would reconcile him to the Church, an act of civil authority. But such testimonies as this is, they that have no better must be forced to use.

That which followeth of Gregory's² confirming the privileges granted to the abbey of Saint Medardus, in such sort, that whatsoever kings, judges, or secular persons, should go about to violate them, should be deprived of their honour, proveth not the thing in question. For it is evident, that the confirmation of these privileges was passed, not by St Gregory alone, but by a whole council, and more specially by Theodoricus the king, and Brunichildis the queen, who might bind their successors, and other inferior secular rulers, under pain of deprivation, though neither Gregory of himself, nor yet a

¹ Psalm cxix. 25.

² In fine Epist. Greg. [Chap. xxxviii. p. 361. supra.]

council of bishops, could do any such thing by their authority alone.

Wherefore let us proceed to the next example. "Gregory the Second," saith Bellarmine, "excommunicated the emperor Leo the Third, who was an enemy to images: he forbade any tribute to be paid him out of Italy, and consequently deprived him of part of his empire¹." Surely if Gregory the Second of himself alone had had such power as to forbid all Italy, upon his dislike, to pay any more tribute to the emperor, there were some good show of proof in this allegation. But if we examine the stories, we shall find the case to have been far otherwise than Bellarmine would bear us in hand it was. For first, Gregory did not excommunicate Leo of himself, but called a synod to do it. Secondly, he did not forbid the paying of tribute out of Italy to the emperor: but the circumstances of the history are these. Leo, seeking to win the bishop of Rome, and the people of Italy, to the casting down of images in the West, as he had done in the East, Gregory the bishop did not only refuse to obey him, but admonished all other to take heed they did no such thing for fear of any edict of the emperor. By which exhortation the people of Italy, already mis-conceited of the emperor's government, were so animated, that they were likely to have proceeded to the election of a new emperor: and Naclerus² sheweth, that the decrees of the bishop of Rome, dissuading the people of the West from obeying the emperor, in casting down of images, were of so great authority, that the people and soldiers of Ravenna first, and then of Venice, began to make show of rebellion against the emperor, and his exarch or lieutenant, and to enforce the bishop of Rome, and the other people of Italy, to disclaim the emperor of Constantinople, and to choose another in Italy. And that this rebellion proceeded so far, that every city putting down the magistrates of the exarch, set up magistrates of their own, whom they named dukes; but that the bishop of Rome at that time pacified them, and by his persuasions stayed them from choosing any new emperor, in hope that he would amend. So that we see, the bishop of Rome with his bishops, by their authority did nothing but

¹ Zonaras in Vita Leonis Isauri. [Annal. Lib. xv. cap. 4. Tom. II. p. 82. Ven. 1729.]

² Nacler. in Chron. Vol. II. Gener. xxv. p. 654. [Colon. 1579.]

stay the people from obeying the emperor's unlawful decrees, as they judged them; but no way went about to depose the emperor, or to deprive him of anything that of right pertained to him. But the people of Italy moved against the emperor, proceeded further than the bishop of Rome would have had them to have done. For they put down the magistrates appointed by the emperor, and set up other of their own; and would have forced the bishop of Rome, and the other people of Italy, who yet consented not unto them, to disclaim the emperor of Constantinople, and to choose another in Italy. And therefore, if at that time they forbore to pay any more tribute, (as Zonaras¹ saith they did) it was not because the pope forbade them so to do (as having supreme power in civil things), but being averse from the emperor, as for other dislikes, so by the pope's persuasions, they stayed the tribute of themselves, as of themselves they put down the magistrates of the emperor, without the liking of the bishop of Rome. That which Otho Frisingensis hath², that the pope having often admonished the emperor, and found him incorrigible, persuaded the people of Italy to depart from the empire, seemeth to be contrary to the reports of the author of the great Chronicle³, Naclerus⁴, Rhegino⁵, and others; but yet maketh the pope only a persuader, and the people of Italy the doers of that was done. And in like sort it must be understood that Zonaras saith, the bishop of Rome stayed the paying of tribute to the emperor, namely, that his dislike of the emperor's courses, together with their own distaste of his actions, did so avert the minds of the Italians from the emperor, that they refused to pay him tribute; that being attributed to him as done by him, which his persuasions (though tending to another purpose) did work without his liking, and against his will. And in the same sense it is that Sigebert saith⁶, Gregory charged the emperor with error, blamed him for it, and turned away the people of Rome, and the tribute of the West from him.

¹ Ubi supra.

² Lib. v. cap. 18. Chronici. [Tom. viii. p. 65. Biblioth. Patr. Cisterc. per Bernard. Tissier. Par. 1669.]

³ Lib. Chron. ab initio mundi cum figuris et imaginibus in vi. ætate mundi. [Hartmann Schedel, fol. 160. b. Nuremb. 1493.]

⁴ Ubi supra.

⁵ Chron. Lib. i. [p. 18. in Pistor. Illustr. Vet. Script. German.]

⁶ Chronic. Anno 731. [p. 546. ibid.]

The third instance of popes intermeddling in the dispositions of the kingdoms of the world, is that of Zacharias the pope, of whom Gregory the Seventh in his epistles writeth thus¹: "Another Roman bishop also, to wit, Zacharias, deposed the French king from his kingdom, not so much for any fault done by him, as for that he was unfit to sway so great power; and put Pipine, the father of Charles the Great, afterwards emperor, into his place, freeing and absolving all the Frenchmen from their oath of fealty." Which words of Gregory are found likewise in the decrees². To this allegation Occam³ answereth, that Zacharias did not depose Childerick the French king (as Gregory the Seventh untruly reporteth), but only gave allowance of the peers deposing of him. And to that purpose allegeth the Gloss upon the decrees, which saith, *Dicitur deposuisse quia deponentibus consensit*⁴: that is, "The pope is said to have deposed the king, because he gave

¹ "Alius item Romanus pontifex, Zacharias videlicet, regem Francorum non tam pro suis iniquitatibus quam pro eo quod tantæ potestati non erat utilis a regno deposuit, et Pipinum Caroli magni imperatoris patrem in ejus loco substituit: omnesque Francigenas a juramento fidelitatis quod illi fecerant absolvit."—Greg. VII. Lib. viii. Epist. xxi. [Concill. Reg. Tom. xxvi. p. 457. Par. 1644.]

² Part. ii. Causa xv. [Qu. 6. can. 3. col. 1178.]

³ "Aliter dicunt quidam quod papa auctoritate papali nec imperatorem nec regem Franciæ potest deponere, nisi pro hæresi; tamen papa auctoritate Romanorum posset pro quibusdam aliis causis deponere imperatorem; et auctoritate Francorum potest quibusdam aliis causis deponere regem Francorum, et hæc glossa super cap. allegato sentire videtur, quæ super verbo 'deposuit,' ait: 'dicitur deposuisse, quia deponentibus consensit,' recipiendo scilicet ab eis potestatem deponendi: ideo quasi una cum eis deposuit. Aliter dicitur quod Zacharias papa deponendo regem Francorum misit falcem suam in messem alienam, potestatem usurpando sibi ex officio nullatenus competentem, quod et alii summi pontifices in præjudicium laicorum facere dignoscuntur, teste Glossa quæ Extrav. 'de foro competenti,' cap. 'si quis clericus,' ait: 'Papa sive sint negligentes (scil. laici in exhibendo justitiam clericis,) sive non, quotidie concedit literas clericis contra laicos super quacunque quæstione et ita usurpat jurisdictionem aliorum,' contra quod dicit cap. proximo super verbo 'Novit,' *ubi sic loquitur, 'Non putet aliquis quod jurisdictionem istius illustris regis Francorum turbare minime intendamus, cum ipse jurisdictionem nostram nec velit, nec debeat impedire.'"—Ockam. Dialog. Part. iii. Tract. 2. Lib. i. cap. 18. [Apud Goldast. Tom. ii. p. 886.]

⁴ Gloss. super cap. allegat. [col. 1178.]

* [Scil. tit. proximo, De Judic. Cap. 13. col. 531.]

consent to those that did depose him, and allowed their act." But he noteth also, that there are others that do not so excuse the pope, but do think he put his sickle into another man's harvest, and took upon him to do that he had no authority to do; which other popes likewise have not feared to do, in prejudice of the right of the laity, as they show out of another Gloss¹. So that the Century writers² are not alone in the reprehension of this fact of Zacharias, (as Bellarmine untruly avoucheth³); notwithstanding I rather follow the judgment of the author of the Gloss, and think that he did but give his opinion what might be done, and approve the act when it was done. For confirmation whereof, I will lay down the circumstances of the narration touching the proceedings in this matter, as I find them reported by ancient writers. First, all historians agree⁴ that the kings of France in those times, giving themselves to idleness and pleasures, wholly neglected the government; that they were seen but only once in the year of their subjects; and that the governor of the king's house ruled all. Neither did things stand thus for a short space, but Sigebert saith⁵ they continued so eighty-eight years. In this office of a prefect or governor Pipine succeeded his ancestors, but exceeded them in the greatness of worthy exploits; neither did anything hinder the course of his great and honourable actions, but that he was forced to suffer and endure a king almost witless and mad with divers senseless fooleries. Wherefore they who write the histories of France report, that the nobles and people of that nation, duly weighing the virtue of Pipine, and the witless follies of Childerick the king, consulted Zachary then bishop of Rome, and desired him to tell them whether he thought so foolish and unworthy a king were any longer to be endured, or Pipine to be de-

¹ Gloss. Extra. de foro competent. cap. 'Si quis Clericus.' [col. 512.]

² Cent. VIII. cap. 10. [col. 392. Bas. 1624.]

³ "Hoc etiam factum hæretici agnoscunt, et reprehendunt, ut Magdeburgenses, Cent. VIII. cap. 10. ubi dicunt Zachariam papam quasi divinam auctoritatem sibi proterve assumpsisse. At nec hujus facti ullum invenire potuerunt in antiquis scriptoribus reprehensorem; nos autem plurimos habemus approbatores, nimirum Adonem, Sigebertum, Reginonem in Chronicis."—Bellarm. De Pont. Rom. Lib. v. cap. 8. [Tom. i. p. 442.]

⁴ Lib. Chron. Ætate VI. in Pipino. [fol. 165, A.]

⁵ Chron. Anno 750 [p. 549.]

frauded of royal dignity which he deserved, and was right worthy of. Who when they had received answer from the pope, that he was to be esteemed the king who knew best how to perform kingly duties, the French, by the public and common advice and counsel of the whole nation, proclaimed Pipine king, and shored the head of Childerick, and made him a clerk. Naucerus saith¹, the Frenchmen anciently had their kings descended of an ancient stock, who of Meroveus, the son of king Clodius the Second, were called Merovingians: the race of which kings continued till Childerick, and in him ended. For long before they were of no esteem or authority, neither had they anything but the vain and empty title of kings; for the riches and power of the kingdom were in the hands of the prefects of the palace, who were called the chief of the king's house, and swayed the whole kingdom, who at that time were the successors of Charles Martel, and were named dukes. Neither was there any other thing permitted to the king, but that, contenting himself with the bare name of a king, having long hair and a long beard, he should sit upon the throne, and have some show of a ruler, and hear ambassadors coming from all parts, and give such answers unto them (as out of his own power) which he was taught and commanded to give. He had nothing to live on but such a stipend and allowance as the prefect was pleased to allow unto him. He possessed nothing but one little village; once only in the year he was seen of his subjects, in a public and solemn assembly; and having saluted them all, returned again into his private course of life, leaving the government of all to the prefect. Pipine therefore, who then supplied that place, as succeeding his ancestors in the same, considering the sloth and idleness of these kings, who neglecting the commonwealth did hide themselves in their own private houses; and that both the nobles and people took notice as well of his virtues, as of the senseless follies of Childerick, consulted the pope (as we heard before): upon whose answer (that he was to be reputed king that could best do the duty of a king) the French, by a public decree of the whole nation, chose Pipine to be king; which thing Zachary approved. Otho Frisingensis saith², that the French sent messengers to Rome *sciscitandi gratia*, to ask the pope's advice, and to be

¹ Naucler. Chronol. Vol. ii. Gener. xxvi. [p. 663, 4.]

² Chronic. Lib. v. cap. 21 et 22. [p. 66.]

resolved by him ; upon whose answer, and by whose authority (warranting them it was lawful so to do), Bonifacius archbishop of Mentz, and the other princes of the kingdom, met together, and chose Pipine king. And Rhegino saith¹, Pipine was chosen king according to the manner and custom of the French, and, being anointed by the hands of Bonifacius archbishop of Mentz, was by the French lifted up into the royal throne, and Childerick, who was but in title only a king, was shorn, and thrust into a monastery. With these agreeth Sigebertus², and the rest. Wherefore to conclude this point, touching the deposition of Childerick, we must observe : first, that he was not deposed for heresy, or any way going about to hinder the course of religion ; and that therefore the pope could not depose him, unless princes be subject to such censures for defects of nature, and negligence in doing their duties. Secondly, that he and his predecessors, for almost an hundred years, were put from all government, and were but in name only kings, others having the authority, and that with the allowance of the whole state. So that it is the less to be marvelled, if the pope, being consulted as a divine, answered, it was fit rather that he should have the name, title, and inauguration of a king, that was to do the duty, than he that was but to be a shadow only. Yet do I not say that he spake like a good divine. Thirdly, that in those times the university of Paris was not yet founded ; and the kingdom had few learned men, and that therefore they sought to foreigners. For otherwise we know that afterwards the kings and princes of France rather believed the divines of Paris than the court of Rome, in greater matters than this³. Fourthly, that the bishop of Rome, as patriarch of the West, was the chief bishop in these parts of the world, and therefore not unfitly consulted in a matter of such consequence as this was.

Wherefore let us now proceed to the fourth instance, which is that of the translation of the west empire from the emperors of Constantinople to Charles the Great ; which our adversaries say was done by pope Leo the Third. But surely whosoever shall look into the course of histories shall find, that this instance maketh rather against them than for

¹ Lib. II. [pp. 22, 3.]

² Loco citato.

³ Gerson in Serm. de Paschate, Part. IV. Operum ejus. [Tom. III. col. 1205.]

them. For it is most certain that the pope by his papal power did not translate the empire. "The Romans," saith Sigebert¹, "who long before in their hearts were fallen away from the emperor of Constantinople, now taking the opportunity of the occasion offered, while a woman having put out the eyes of Constantine the emperor her son, took upon her to rule over them, with one consent proclaimed Charles the king their emperor, and by the hands of Leo the pope set the crown upon his head, and gave him the title of Cæsar and Augustus." With Sigebertus the author of the great Chronicle agreeth: his words are these²: "In the time of the solemnities of the mass celebrated upon Christmas-day in St Peter's church, Leo the pope, by the decree of the people of Rome, and at their entreaty, crowned Charles proclaimed emperor of the Romans, and set such a diadem upon his head as the ancient emperors were wont to wear; and then the people, which was present in great number, with joyful acclamation cried out thrice: *Carolo Augusto, a Deo coronato, magno et pacifico Imperatori, vita et victoria.*" So that we see it was the decree of the Romans that made Charles emperor, and that they used Leo for the performance of the solemn rites of his coronation and unction. With Sigebert and the author of the great Chronicle we may join Lambertus Schaffnaburgensis³: his words are, *Carolus a Romanis Augustus est appellatus*: that is, "The Romans proclaimed Charles Augustus;" and Naclerus saith⁴, "*Pontifex populi Romani consensu, Carolum Romanorum Imperatorem declarat, &c.*:" that is, 'The high bishop, with the consent of the people of Rome, proclaimeth Charles emperor of Romans, and crowneth him with a diadem:' the people with a joyful shout crying out thrice, *Carolo Augusto, a Deo coronato, magno et pacifico Imperatori, vita et victoria.*" But to clear this point, and to make it evident to all the world, that howsoever the pope and clergy might concur in this act with the people and nobles of Italy, as having part and interest in matters of state as well as other, yet the pope by his papal power did not translate the empire, three things are to be observed. The first, that in the time of Gregory the Second there was

¹ Sigebert, anno 801. [p. 557.]

² Ætate vi. in Leone. [fol. 167, B.]

³ Anno 800. [p. 153. apud Pistor. ut supra.]

⁴ Chronol. Vol. II. Gener. xxvii. [p. 678.]

a great rebellion in Italy against the emperor of Constantinople, and a desire to choose a new emperor, and that they of Ravenna and Venice proceeded so far in it, that they would have forced the bishop of Rome and others to concur with them: whereby it appeareth that the act of translation was not proper to the bishop of Rome, but proceeded from the concurring desires of the Italians, and was their act rather than his. The second, that Charles¹ was a mighty, potent, and great prince, having under him all France, Spain, and a great part of Germany, with many other countries; and by his sword had subjected to him the Lombards, and was lord of the greatest part of Italy, before either the people proclaimed him, or the pope crowned him emperor. So that howsoever the Italians by Leo the bishop proclaimed, crowned, and accounted him emperor; yet it was his right of inheritance, and his sword that had possessed him of the thing, before ever they gave him the title of the west empire. The third, that whether the Italians had right to choose an emperor or not, it mattereth nothing, seeing they rebelled against their emperor, and thought that in case of such necessity they might so do; and that therefore the objection of Bellarmine against our position is too weak, when he saith the people had no power to choose the emperor. For howsoever anciently the emperors were chosen by the soldiers, or came to it by inheritance, yet the people at this time *de facto* took upon them to choose, without curious disputing the question of right.

The fifth instance of the popes intermeddling in the disposition of the kingdoms of the world, is that of Gregory the Fifth, who (as Bellarmine saith) appointed the form of choosing the emperor by the seven princes of Germany, and ordained that the emperor should ever after be chosen by them. For the clearing of which point, we must observe², that the empire of the West being translated from Constantinople into France, in the person of Charles the Great, he died, and Ludovicus his son succeeded him. Lotharius succeeded Ludovicus, and Ludovicus his son succeeded him. Carolus Calvus his uncle succeeded Ludovicus; Carolus Crassus, his brother Ludovicus' son, succeeded him. This Carolus Crassus

¹ Great Chron. in Carolo. [fol. 167.]

² Great Chron. in Gregory V. [fol. 181, B, et 183 A.] Naocl. Vol. II. Generat. xxviii. et sequentibus. [p. 699. sq.]

for his unfitness was put from the empire, and Arnulphus his nephew, son of Carlomain, was chosen in his place; who was the last of the race of Charles the Great that was crowned emperor, whom Ludovicus his son succeeded, but was never crowned. In whom, dying without children, the race of Charles did wholly cease. After him Otho the duke of Saxony was greatly desired; but refusing to be emperor in respect of his old age, the French by his advice chose Conradus; and Conradus, when he died, named Henry, the son of Otho duke of Saxony, who reigned in East-France. But upon the death of Ludovicus the Third, the Lombards possessed themselves of the empire in Italy, eight of them successively holding it for the space of fifty years, till Otho, the son of Matilda (daughter of Theodoricus king of the Saxons) and Henry the king, who succeeding his father, and being very famous for the things he had done in France and Germany, was desired by Agapetus the pope, and many nobles of Italy, now weary of the tyranny of the Lombards, to come and relieve them; which he did, and entering Italy with fifty thousand armed men, put Berengarius the Lombard from the empire, and Albertus from the kingdom of all Italy, and was crowned emperor in Rome by John the Twelfth; who died emperor, and Otho the Second his son succeeded him, and Otho the Third his son succeeded him. This third Otho (as Naucerus saith¹) having no heirs male, by the advice and with the consent of the princes of Germany, made a decree, that after the death of the emperor an election of the new emperor to succeed should for ever be made in the city of Franckfort; and appointed electors three archbishops, of Mentz for Germany, of Coleyn for Italy, and of Trevers for France; and with these four other secular princes, to wit, the palatine of Rhene, who by office should be the emperor's pantler; the duke of Saxony, who should be his marshal; the marquess of Branderburge, who was to be his chamberlain; and the king of Boheme, who was to be chief butler. This ordinance greatly displeased the Romans, yet notwithstanding Gregory the Fifth, then pope, who was a German born, and of the emperor's house, seeing how hardly Otho the emperor came to the empire, though it were his inheritance, called a synod; and, with the consent of the princes of Germany, confirmed

¹ Vol. II. Generat. xxxiv. [p. 742.]

the ordinance of the emperor, and decreed that these seven electors should for ever have power to choose the emperor in the name of all; who being chosen, should be called Cæsar and king of Romans, and after his coronation by the pope, be named Augustus and emperor. Cardinal Cusanus saith¹, the emperor Otho, with the consent of the nobles, primates, and both the states of the clergy and people, ordained electors in the time of Gregory the Fifth, who was a German, and decreed that they should have power for ever to choose the emperor in stead of all. It is not therefore to be granted (saith he) that the princes electors have their power of choosing the emperor from the pope, so that without his consent they should not have it, or that he might take it from them if he would. Who therefore gave the people of Rome power to choose the emperor, but the law of God, and nature? whence the electors, appointed by the common consent of all the Germans, and other subject to the empire in the time of Henry the Second, have their power originally from the common consent of them all, who by nature's right had power to constitute them an emperor; and not from the bishop of Rome, who hath no power to give to any province of the world a king or emperor, without the consent thereof. But the consent of Gregory the Fifth, who as bishop of Rome in his degree and place had interest to give voice in the choosing of the emperor, concurred with the resolution of the princes and people.

The sixth instance is of Gregory the Seventh deposing Henry the Fourth, who, indeed, was the first pope that ever took upon him to depose emperor or king. Wherefore, for the better understanding of the whole course of the proceedings of this pope, we must observe², that in the time of

¹ "Hic imperator consensu procerum primatum et utriusque status cleri et populi perpetuos electores qui vice omnium elegerunt ordinavit, tempore Gregorii V. Alemanni, consanguinei quondam Othonis. Non est igitur eo modo concedendum electores a Romano pontifice potestatem eligendi habere, sic quod nisi ipse consentiret non haberent, aut si vellet ab ipsis tollere posset. Quis, rogo, dedit populo Romano potestatem eligendi imperatorem nisi ipsum jus divinum et naturale: per viam enim voluntariæ subjectionis et consensus in præsidentiam prælationes concordantiales recte et sancte constitutæ sunt, in omni dominandi specie: omnis enim violentia juri obviat."—Nicol. De Cusa. De Concord. Cathol. Lib. iii. cap. 4. [p. 785.]

² Otho Frisingens. Chronic. Lib. vi. cap. 32, 33. [pp. 80, 1.]

Henry the Third, about the year of our Lord 1040, there was an horrible confusion of God's Church and people in the city of Rome, three several pretenders invading the chair of Peter, and challenging the name of his successors, and (which more increased the misery) the revenues of the Church were divided among these three, and several patriarchal places assigned to them; one of them sitting at St Peter's, another at St Mary the greater, and the third, named Benedict, in the palace of Lateran; and all of them lived very lewdly and wickedly (as Otho saith the Romans reported unto him being in Rome). A certain religious presbyter named Gratian, considering this miserable state of the Church, and taking pity on his distressed mother, moved with the zeal of piety, went to the three pretenders, and persuaded them for money to leave the holy seat of Peter; assigning to Benedict, as being of greater esteem among them, the revenues of England for his maintenance, and as a recompense of his voluntary relinquishing the claim to the popedom. The citizens of Rome, admiring the happy achievement of this presbyter, chose him to be pope, as being the deliverer of the Church from so great a schism; and changing his name, called him Gregory the Seventh. But when Henry the king heard of it he passed into Italy. Gratian understanding of his coming, met him at Sutrium, and to pacify his wrath offered him a precious diadem. The king at the first honourably received him; but afterwards calling a council of bishops, induced him to give over the popedom, as having by simony obtained it at the first; and, with the consent of the Roman Church, placed Suidegerus, bishop of Babenberge, in the papal chair, who was named Clemens. This Clemens died, and Popio, patriarch of Aquileia, succeeded him, and was named Damasus. Damasus died, and Bruno, bishop of the Tullians, succeeded him, and was named Leo. This man being of a noble race in France, was appointed pope by the authority of the emperor; and having put on the papal purple robe, journeyed through France, till he came to Cluniack, where one Hildebrand was prior. This Hildebrand moved with zeal came to Leo, and told him that he did ill to assume the papal office by virtue of the emperor's nomination being a layman; but that if he would be advised by him, he would direct him into a course whereby he might, without offending the emperor, preserve the liberty of the Church in choosing her chief

bishop. This advice Leo hearkened unto, and putting off his purple robe, put on the weed of a pilgrim, and so going to Rome with this Hildebrand in his company, by his advice and counsel, found the means to get himself chosen pope by the clergy and people of Rome. Leo died, and Gebehardus, afterwards named Victor, succeeded him, and Stephen him: about whose time Henry the Third died, and Henry the Fourth his son succeeded him; and after Stephen, Benedict, and Nicholas, Alexander gat the papal see¹, against whom great exception was taken, for that, contrary to the custom, he was chosen without the emperor's consent, and with the liking of the young emperor and his mother, as some report. Another was set up by the bishops of Lombardy, affirming that no man might be chosen or designed to the popedom, without the emperor's allowance. And besides, Anno, archbishop of Coleyn, went to Rome to expostulate the matter with Alexander and the cardinals adhering to him, and to know of him how he durst, contrary to custom, and the law prescribed and imposed anciently upon the popes, assume the popedom without the consent of the emperor: alleging many things to show the unlawfulness of this fact; and beginning at Charles the Great, he named many emperors who had either chosen or confirmed popes, and made good their election. But being ready to go forward, and to add more proofs unto that which he had said, Hildebrand the archdeacon (the whole company of cardinals beckoning unto him so to do) stood up, and answered in this sort: "Archbishop Anno, the kings and emperors of Rome never had any authority, right, or commanding power in the choice of the pope: and if at any time anything were done violently or disorderly, it was afterwards corrected and set right again by the censure of the fathers." After the death of Alexander, this Hildebrand, who thus ever opposed himself against the emperor's claims, was by the Romans chosen pope, without the emperor's consent. Which the bishops of France understanding, knowing well of how violent, severe, and untractable a disposition he was, unwilling to have him possess so high a place in the Church, told the emperor, that if he did not in time prevent the matter, and void his election, greater evils and perils would beset him than he could at first think of. Whereupon he sent ambassadors to Rome to know the

¹ Naucier. Vol. II. Gener. 36. [p. 787.]

cause why the Romans, contrary to the ancient custom, had chosen a pope without his consent. And if they gave not satisfaction, to put Hildebrand from the papal dignity which he had unjustly gotten. The ambassadors coming to Rome, were kindly and courteously entertained, and when they had delivered their message, Hildebrand (like a vile dissembling hypocrite), contrary to his own practice, and that which he had persuaded other unto, answered, that he never sought this honour, but that it was put upon him; and that yet he would not accept of it, till by a certain ambassador he was assured, that not only the emperor, but the princes of Germany, consented to his election. Which answer when the emperor received, he was fully satisfied, and with all readiness by his royal consent confirmed his election, and commanded that he should be ordained. Thus we see, how to serve his own turn, he could now acknowledge the emperor's interest, and refuse to be ordained before he had obtained his confirmation, which yet before in the case of Alexander he disclaimed: though some say¹ he never yielded so much to the emperor, but ever held out against him, disclaiming his intermeddling, and that a most horrible schism ensued thereupon. Howsoever, he was no sooner pope, but he began to molest the emperor, challenging him for simony in conferring ecclesiastical dignities, and requiring him to come to some synodal answer; which when he refused to do, he excommunicated him, deprived him of his empire, and absolved his subjects from their oath of obedience. This was the first pope that ever presumed to depose any emperor. *Lego et relego*, saith Otho Frisingensis², *Romanorum regum et imperatorum gesta, et nusquam invenio quenquam eorum ante hunc a Romano pontifice excommunicatum, vel regno privatum, nisi forte quis pro anathemate habendum ducat, quod Philippus ad breve tempus a Romano pontifice inter pœnitentes collocatus, et Theodosius a beato Ambrosio propter cruentam cædem a liminibus ecclesiæ sequestratus sit*: that is, "I read, and I read over again and again, the acts of the Roman kings and emperors, and I nowhere find any of them before this excommunicated by the Roman bishop, or deprived of his kingdom, unless haply any man do think that is to be taken for an excommunication, that Philip was for

¹ Otho Frisingens. Lib. vi. cap. 34 et 35. [pp. 81, 2.]

² Otho Fris. Lib. vi. Chron. cap. 35. [p. 82.]

a short time put among the penitents by the bishop of Rome, and Theodosius for his bloody murder stopped by blessed Ambrose from entering into the church." And therefore whatsoever Gregory pretendeth to the contrary¹, professing that he treadeth in the steps of the saints, and his holy predecessors; yet it is true that Sigebert saith², (which he hopeth he may say with the leave of all good men,) that this novelty (that he say not heresy) had not showed itself in the world in their time, that the priests of that God which maketh hypocrites to reign for the sins of his people, should teach his people that they owe no subjection to wicked kings, and that they owe no fealty unto them, though they have taken the oath of fealty; that they are free from perjury that lift up their hands against the king to whom they have sworn, and that they are to be taken for excommunicate persons that do obey him. What horrible confusions followed upon this censure of Gregory, Otho Frisingensis reporteth in most tragical manner. His words are these³: "How great evils, how many wars and dangers of wars, followed thence! How often was miserable Rome besieged, taken, and sacked! How one pope was intruded upon another, as likewise one king set up against another, it is irksome to me to remember. To conclude, the whirlwind of this tempest inwrapped in it so many evils, so many schisms, so many perils of the souls and bodies of men, that it alone may suffice in respect of the cruelty of the persecution, and the long continuance of the time thereof, to set before our eyes the infelicity of man's miserable condition." For first⁴, the emperor offended with the pope for molesting him about the investitures of bishops, which his predecessors anciently had and enjoyed, and the clergy discontented with him for his forbidding marriage, he was, in an assembly of the states and bishops of Germany holden at Worms, deposed, and a letter written to him requiring him no longer to meddle with the episcopal office; but such was the resolution and stoutness of this turbulent and unquiet spirit, that being encouraged by certain bishops of Germany, and promised their aid and help, he de-

¹ Decr. Part. II. Caus. 15. Quæst. 6. [Can. 4. col. 1177] Lib. VIII. Epist. xxi. [Concill. Reg. Tom. XXVI. p. 457. Par. 1644.]

² In Chron. anno MLXXXVIII. [p. 606.]

³ Chron. Lib. VI. cap. 36. [p. 82.]

⁴ Naucier. Vol. II. Gener. 36. [p. 773.]

prived the bishops that had given sentence against him, and deposed Henry the emperor, absolving his subjects from their oath of obedience. Whereupon many of the princes of Germany, and first of all the Saxons formerly averse from him, withdrew their subjection, pretending that they might justly cast off the yoke, and refuse to obey him any longer, seeing having been called to give satisfaction to two popes concerning certain crimes objected to him, he had refused to appear, and was thereupon excommunicated. These rebellions and defections so affrighted the nobles and princes of the empire that still remained well affected to the emperor, that for the staying of present confusions, and preventing of other, they thought good that the pope should be entreated to come into Germany, and that then the emperor should submit himself unto him, and ask forgiveness; which thing accordingly was effected: for the pope was persuaded, and consented to come into Germany, and was coming towards Augusta, as far as Versella. But when he came thither, pretending fear that the emperor meant not well towards him, he brake off his journey, and went to Canossum, and there stayed. Which the emperor hearing of, and doubting what might be the cause of his stay, hastened thither, and putting off all royal robes, on his bare feet came to the gates of the town, humbly beseeching that he might be let in; but was stayed without three days, though it were extreme cold winter weather: which he endured patiently, continually entreating, till in the end he was let in and absolved; but yet conditionally, that being called, he should appear in an assembly of princes and bishops, to answer such crimes as were objected to him; and either to purge himself and so retain his kingdom, or otherwise failing so to do, to lose it. This his submission afterwards he made known to the Italians, who understanding what he had done, were exceedingly enraged against him, derided the legates of the pope, and contemned his curses, as being deposed by all the bishops of Italy for just causes, as namely, for simony, murder, adultery, and other most horrible and capital crimes; and told him, that he had done a most intolerable thing, in submitting himself and his kingly majesty to an heretic and most infamous person. Yea, they proceeded so far, that they told him, because he had so done, they were resolved to make his son emperor in his stead, and to go to Rome and choose a new

pope, by whom he might be consecrated, and all the proceedings of this false pope voided. But the emperor excusing himself for that which he had done, as driven by necessity so to do, and promising to revenge these wrongs, when opportunity should be offered, pacified them in such sort, that they began to incline to him again. Yet were not his evils at an end hereby. For his enemies among the Germans presently took the opportunity of this his relapse, and calling an assembly with the legates of the pope, chose a new emperor, Rodolph, duke of Suevia; to whom the pope sent an imperial crown, having this inscription: *Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodolpho*¹: which when he heard of, he called a council of the bishops of Italy and Germany, and charging Hildebrand the pope with most horrible crimes of heresy, necromancy, perjury, murder, and the like, deposed him, chose Guibertus², bishop of Ravenna in his place, and gathering together a great and mighty army, went against Rodolph abiding in Saxony, where a most terrible and bloody battle was fought between them: in which battle Rodolph was wounded; and going aside from his companions, with many other likewise wounded, was carried to Mersberge, where he died; who a little before his death beholding his right hand cut off in that battle, fetching a deep sigh, said to the bishops which by chance were present: "Behold, this is the hand with which by solemn vow and oath I obliged my faith and fealty to Henry my lord. Behold now I leave his kingdom and this present life, see you that made me climb up into his throne, what you have done: would to God you had led me the right way, whom you found so willing to follow your advice and counsel, and to be directed by you." Yet did neither the ill success of the former attempt, nor the speeches of Rodolph at his death, blaming those that had set him a work, and condemning himself for that which he had done, discourage the ill affected from proceeding on in their rebellious practices. For they set up Hermannus, prince of Lorraine, instead of Rodolph, and proclaimed him emperor, whom the emperor Henry slew likewise, as he had done the other; and rested not till he had made pope Hildebrand leave Rome, and fly to Salernum; and brought the new pope, named Clement, to be

¹ [Aventin. Annal. Boior. Lib. v. cap. 14. § 13. p. 552. Lips. 1710.]

² [Naucier. Generat. 37. p. 778.]

enthronized, and himself crowned by him in Rome. “The acts of Hildebrand,” saith Naclerus¹, “were such, that the writers be very doubtful whether the things that were done by him were done out of any love of virtue, or any zeal he bare to the faith, or not.” They that loved him best disliked his stiffness, as Aventinus witnesseth². Otho Frisingensis noteth³ that his disposition was such, that for the most part he ever liked that which others disliked. So that of Lucan might be verified of him: *Victrix causa diis placuit, sed victa Catoni*: that is, “The prevailing part and cause best pleased God, but that which fell, and had the overthrow, had Cato’s wishes;” and though he commend his zeal, yet in his Prologue of his seventh book he taxeth him, and others like unto him, in very bitter sort⁴. His words are these: *Videntur tamen culpandi sacerdotes per omnia, qui regnum suo gladio, quem ipsi ex regum habent gratia, ferire conantur. Nisi forte David imitari cogitant, qui Philistæum primo virtute Dei stravit, postmodum proprio gladio jugulavit*: that is, “Notwithstanding whatsoever may be said, the priests seem altogether blameable and worthy of reproof and reprehension, which go about to strike kings and princes with that their sword which they have by the grace and favour of princes; unless haply they do think it lawful for them to imitate David, who first overthrew and cast to the ground the proud Philistine by the power of God, and afterwards slew him with his own sword.” Of this Hildebrand, Sigebert saith⁵ he found it thus written: “We will have you know, you that manage the ecclesiastical affairs, and to whom the care of the Church is committed, that the lord, pope Hildebrand, who also was called Gregory, being in *extremis*, and drawing near his end, called unto him one of the twelve cardinals, whom he loved dearly, and more than any of the rest, and in his hearing confessed to God, to holy Peter, and to the whole Church, that he had sinned exceedingly, and grievously offended in the pastoral charge committed to him, and in governing the people of whom he had undertaken the care; and that by the persuasion and instigation of the devil he had stirred up hatred and wrath against mankind: and then commanded the forenamed con-

¹ [p. 781.]² Annal. [Lib. v. cap. 13. § 3. p. 539.]³ Lib. vi. cap. 32. [p. 80.]⁴ [p. 83.]⁵ Anno MLXXXV. [p. 605.]

fessor to make haste to go to the emperor, and to the whole Church of God, to ask forgiveness for him, because he saw the end of his life was near at hand. And besides all this, in great haste put on him an angelical vesture or robe, and released and brake in sunder the bands of all those bitter curses whereunto he had subjected the emperor." These were the turbulent proceedings of this cursed Hildebrand, indeed a brand taken out of the very fire of hell, to set on fire the course of nature, and to put the whole world into a combustion; whereof (if this report mentioned by Sigebertus be true) it repented him not a little before his death. But howsoever, it is most certain that his best friends in the end began wholly to dislike him, when they saw whither his violent and furious passions carried him, and what woful effects followed the same. "Gerochus," saith Aventinus¹, "than whom no man was found more earnestly to defend Hildebrand by books written to justify his proceedings, and who published to the world divers crimes objected to the emperor, mentioned by no other writer, at the last, constrained by the force of truth, taxed the pertinacy, if not the tyranny, of the pope and his adherents, in this sort: *Romani (inquit) sibi divinum usurpant honorem, rationem actorum reddere nolunt, nec sibi dici æquo animo ferunt, cur ita agis? Illud satyricum inculcant, Sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas*: that is, 'The Romans take unto themselves the honor that is proper unto God: they will give no account for any thing they do; they will be subject to no control, neither can they endure with any patience that any man should say to any of them, Sir, why do you so? That satirical saying they have often in their mouths, So I will have it, so I command it to be. Let my will stand for a reason; for so it shall.'" Thus we see how ill a beginning the popes made of deposing emperors, and how bad success they had. Which is not to be marvelled at, seeing in these attempts and practices they were contrary to Christ and his apostles. For these (as Aventinus noteth) acknowledged the emperors, as also all the holy fathers did, to be in the second place and rank after God, and before all mortal men, given, appointed, and chosen by the immortal God; and honoured them, as having the crown set upon their heads by God himself; they prayed daily for

¹ Annal. Lib. v. [cap. 13. § 3. p. 539.]

their prosperity, they paid tribute unto them, and proclaimed them rebels against God that refused to be subject to them. After this bad beginning, some two or three other popes succeeding, attempted, in like sort as Hildebrand had done, to depose such emperors as they were offended with. Concerning whose attempts and practices, let the reader consider the censure of cardinal Cusanus. His words are these¹: "Let it suffice the pope that he excelleth the emperor as much as the sun doth the moon, and the soul the body; and let him not challenge that which pertaineth not to him; neither let him affirm that the empire is not but by him and in dependence on him: and if haply the deposing of some kings and emperors, the translation of the empire move him so presumptuously for to think, let him know, that if the respect of religion, and due consideration of humility hindered not, it were easy to answer all those things truly and most clearly; and so, that haply these things should no way argue so great a power in the pope, as pope, without the consent or willing acceptation of the parties contending, as is imagined. For there wanted not in ancient times men to defend Henry the Fourth, crowned at Basil by the legates of Rome, from the excommunication of Gregory or Hildebrand. Yea, such there were that were cardinals at that time, and a certain council holden at Rome, nay, which more is, the general council at Basil, holden at that time, did the same things concerning the choosing of

¹ "Sufficiat ei eminentia qua sol supra lunam, et anima est super corpus, absque hoc quod imperium non esse nisi per eum ab eo dependenter affirmet. Si regum et imperatorum depositiones ac imperii translationes et cætera forte ad hoc præsumendum apostolicum moverent, sciat nisi forte religioni et humilitati obstaret omnibus illis vere et clarissimis responderi posse: et taliter quod forte hæc minime tantam potestatem absque partium contententium aut consensu aut acceptatione in papa ut papam arguerent. Non defuerunt antiqui qui Henricum quartum Basileæ coronatum per Romanorum legatos ab excommunicatione Gregorii seu Hildebrandi defendebant. Etiam apostolicæ sedis cardinales pro tunc, ac quoddam concilium Romæ pro tunc celebratum, ipsa immo generalis Basiliensis synodus tunc celebrata illa egit de eligendo Honorium papam, propter quæ Henricus demum excommunicatus pronunciabatur. Sic de Friderico secundo viro utique in ecclesia strenuissimo ac fidei propugnatore scripta defensoria et fortia inveniuntur; ac etiam de aliis imperatoribus acquievit sæpe pontificibus populus ad obedientiæ bonum."—Nicol. De Cusa. De Concord. Cathol. Lib. III. cap. 41. [p. 822.]

Honorius pope, for which Henry the emperor was pronounced excommunicate. And in like sort there are found things excellently and strongly written in defence of Frederick the Second, a most valiant man, and a most constant defender of the faith, as also in defence of other emperors." How much the pope's proceedings against Frederick the Second hindered the course of the sacred war undertaken at that time against the infidels, how many things the pope charged him with which he utterly disclaimed, and how much all Christian princes in the end began to dislike the pride of the Roman court, the histories of those times do sufficiently make known unto us¹. Wherefore to conclude this point, touching the pope's pretended power of deposing princes; seeing the first that ever attempted to exercise the same, was that brand of hell Gregory the Seventh; seeing he had so ill success in this his proud attempt, and caused such confusions in the Christian world, as the like had seldom or never been before; and seeing the best learned about those times and since condemned the opinion of them that think the pope may depose princes, as new and strange, if not heretical: we may safely resolve, that the pope taking upon him to give and take away kingdoms, which is proper to God, is that antichrist that sitteth in the temple of God, as if he were God.

CHAPTER XLVII.

OF THE CIVIL DOMINION WHICH THE POPES HAVE BY THE GIFT OF PRINCES.

HAVING proved that the popes neither directly nor indirectly have power over princes and the kingdoms of the world, or any thing to do in the managing and disposing of civil affairs, by virtue of any grant from Christ, let us proceed to see what temporal dominion and civil power they have by the grant of princes. "It is the resolved opinion almost of all men," saith Cusanus², "that Constantine the emperor gave the whole empire of the west to Sylvester bishop of Rome,

¹ See Math. Paris. Henric. III. p. 682. [fol. Lond. 1571.]

² "Pene omnium sententia indubitata est, Constantinum imperatorem occidentis imperium Romano pontifici Silvestro ac ejus in ævum

and to his successors for ever, so that there can be no emperor of the West but such a one as must wholly depend of the pope, and acknowledge that he holdeth the imperial crown of him." Neither were there many found in ancient times that durst make question of this Donation of Constantine; yet doth this great cardinal and worthy divine profess, that having sought diligently to find out the original of this supposed grant, and the certainty of it (presupposing that Constantine might make such a grant, which yet will never be proved), he greatly wondereth if ever there were any such thing: for that there is no such thing to be found in authentical books, and approved histories. "I have read over," saith he, "again and again all the acts of popes and emperors that by any means I could meet with, the histories of Saint Hierome, who was most diligent in collecting all things, the works of Augustine, Ambrose, and other learned fathers, and the acts of general councils which have been since the council of Nice; and can find no such thing as this supposed Donation, nor any thing that may import that ever there was any such Donation, neither can it stand with the course of things reported unto us by the ancient historians and writers. Damasus, at the request of Hierome, wrote the

successoribus perpetuo dono tradidisse: et ideo etiam si ratio de unitate principantis, scilicet, adversari bono et recto ordini, duo capita fore non concluderet, pateret tamen in occidente imperatorem nullum nisi a papa dependenter imperium cognosceret juste esse posse. Hanc radicem quoad potui investigavi, præsupponens hoc etiam indubitatum esse Constantinum talem donationem agere potuisse: quæ tamen quæstio nec soluta est hactenus nec solvetur verisimiliter unquam. Sed in veritate supra modum admiror si res ita est, eo quod in authenticis libris, et in historiis approbatis non invenitur. Relegi omnia quæ potui gesta imperialia ac Romanorum pontificum, historias sancti Hieronymi, qui ad cuncta colligendum diligentissimus fuit Augustini, Ambrosii, ac aliorum opuscula peritissimorum, revolve gesta sacrorum conciliorum quæ post Nicænum fuere; et nullam invenio concordantiam ad ea quæ de illa donatione leguntur. Sanctus Damasus papa ad instantiam beati Hieronymi actus et gesta prædecessorum dicitur annotasse, in cujus opere de Sylvestri papa non ea inveniuntur quæ vulgo dicuntur... Sunt meo iudicio illa de Constantino apocrypha, sicut fortassis etiam quædam alia longa et magna scripta sanctis Clementi et Anacleto papæ attributa, in quibus volentes Romanam sedem omni laude dignam plus quam ecclesiæ sanctæ expedit et decet exaltare, se penitus aut quasi fundant."—Nicol. De Cusa, De Concord. Cathol. Lib. III. cap. 2. [p. 780, 2.]

lives and actions of his predecessors; and yet in the life of Sylvester reporteth no such thing." He addeth further, that having diligently perused the charter of this grant, he found in it most evident arguments of forgery and falsehood, and therefore saith, he thinketh these things concerning Constantine's Donation to be apocryphal, as some other large writings attributed to Clemens and Anacletus the popes. For first, the epistle of Melchiades touching the primitive Church, and the bounty of Constantine, is proved counterfeit, in that he speaketh of the council of Nice, holden after his death, and of Constantine's Donation, supposed to have been granted in the time of Sylvester, who succeeded him. Besides this, in the charter of Donation, Constantine professeth that he was a leper, that he was freed from the same by Sylvester's means, by whom he was baptized, and that he was first instructed in Christianity by him. Whereas it is a mere fable that is reported of Constantine's leprosy, and it is most certain that he was a Christian before Sylvester was bishop of Rome. "I nowhere ever read," saith Melchior Canus¹, "in any good and approved authors, that Constantine was a leper; but another of that name, surnamed Copronymus, whence haply, through ambiguity of the name, this error might spring, unless this rumour concerning the leprosy of Constantine may seem to have sprung from that we find reported of him, that he went out of the city of Byzantium to certain hot baths for his health's sake." Thomas Aquinas² in his Sum mentioneth this vulgar history of Constantine's leprosy, and (as it seemeth) approveth the same; but Cajetan doth not so, writing upon Thomas; neither wanteth he good authors to induce him to reject this fabulous report: for he hath Platina³,

¹ "Lepra Constantinum laborasse apud idoneos auctores nusquam legi; sed ejus nominis alium cognomento Copronymum; unde fortasse ambiguitate vocis error inductus. Nisi rumor iste de lepra inde ortus videri possit, quod Byzantio ad aquas calidas valetudinis gratia eum egressum ferunt."—Melchior Canus. Loc. Theol. [Lib. xi. cap. 5, p. 512. Col. Agripp. 1605.]

² "Quidam in baptismo consequuntur non solum spiritualem salutem, sed etiam corporalem; sicut patet de Constantino, qui in baptismo mundatus est a lepra."—Thom. Aquin. Summ. Part. III. Quæst. 69. Art. 8. ad quart. arg. [Tom. xii. fol. 222, B. Ven. 1593.]

³ "Quod vero in lepram incideret, ut vulgo dicitur, baptismoque mundatus sit, conficta prius de sanguine infantum nescio qua fabula, nullo modo credo."—Plat. in Vit. Marci. [p. 48. Colon. Ubior. 1600.]

in the life of Mark, Ludovicus Vives, in his book *De Corruptis Disciplinis*¹, and Alciat², all flatly denying and rejecting this report: and he hath all ancient writers of that age passing it over in silence; who would never have omitted it, if they had known of any such thing, and would undoubtedly have known it, if there had been any such thing. Touching his baptism, all the ancient historians, Hierome³, Eusebius⁴, Socrates⁵, Theodoritus⁶, Sozomen⁷, Cassiodorus⁸, Pomponius Lætus, and others of that rank, affirm that he was baptized by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, a little before his death, and not by Sylvester. The author of the Pontifical, who is full of fables, the feigned charter of Constantine's Donation, and some late writers, deceived by these late forgeries, affirm

¹ "Quale est in res sacras hanc quoque licentiam mentiendi irrepsisse, seu potius aperte esse invectam, ut quæ traduntur de lepra Constantini," &c.—Ludovic. Vives, *De Caus. Corrupt. Art. Lib. II.* [Tom. I. p. 371. Bas. 1555.]

² "Lepra nunquam laborasse eum idoneos auctores usquam legi: sed ejus nominis Constantinum quintum cognomento Copronymum: unde fortasse æquivocatione nominis error inductus: nam quæ nomine Constantini circumfertur confessio eodem vitio laborat."—Alciat. *Parerg. Jur. Lib. VII. cap. 19.* [Tom. IV. col. 475. Bas. 1582.]

³ "Constantinus extremo suæ vitæ tempore ab Eusebio Nicomediensi episcopo baptizatus in Arianum dogma declinat."—Hieron. in *Chronico.* [Tom. VIII. col. 789.]

⁴ "Ἐπειδὴ εἰς ἔννοιαν ἤκει τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς καθάρσεως τοῦτον εἶναι καιρὸν τῶν ποτὲ αὐτῷ πεπλημμελημένων δεῖν ᾧτο· ὅσα οἶα θνητῷ διαμαρτεῖν ἐπῆλθε ταῦτα ἀπορρύψασθαι τῆς ψυχῆς λόγων ἀπορρήτων δυνάμει σωτηρίῳ γε λόγῳ λουτροῦ πιστεύσας. Τοῦτό τοι διανοηθεὶς γόνυ κλίνας ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἰκέτης ἐγίγνετο τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ ἐξομολογούμενος· ἔνθα δὲ καὶ πρῶτον τῶν διὰ χειροθεσίας εὐχῶν ἡξιούτο· μεταβὰς δ' ἔνθεν ἐπὶ προαστείῳ τῶν Νικομηδέων ἀφικνεῖται πόλεως· κἀνταῦθα συγκαλέσας τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, κ.τ.λ."—Euseb. *De Vit. Constant. Lib. IV.* [cap. 61. p. 660. Cantabr. 1720.]

⁵ "Ἐπεὶ δὲ σφοδροτέρου τοῦ νοσήματος ἦσθετο τὰ μὲν λουτρά ὑπερέθετο· ἀπαίρει δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλενουπόλεως εἰς τὴν Νικομήδειαν· κακεῖ ἐν προαστείῳ διάγων τοῦ Χριστιανικοῦ μεταλαμβάνει βαπτίσματος."—Socrat. *H. E.* [I. 39.]

⁶ "Ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ τῆς Βιθυνίας διάγων ἡρρώστησε. Τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης βιότητος ἄδηλον ἐπιστάμενος τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος τὸ δῶρον ἐδέξατο."—Theodoret. *H. E.* I. 31.

⁷ "Χαλεπώτερον διατεθεὶς διεκομίσθη εἰς Νικομήδειαν, ἔνθα δὲ ἐν προαστείῳ διάγων ἐμνήθη τὴν ἱερὰν βάπτισιν."—Sozom. *H. E.* [II. 34.]

⁸ "Nicomedix in suburbano sacri baptismatis donis initiatus est."—Cassiodor. *Hist. Tripart.* [Lib. III. cap. 12.]

that he was first converted to Christianity by Sylvester, bishop of Rome, and by him baptized, which by no means can be true; it being most certain he was a Christian in the time of Melchiades, Sylvester's predecessor. "It is most certainly true," saith Cusanus¹, "that Constantine the emperor was a Christian in the time of Melchiades the pope, as it appeareth by Austin in divers places, especially in his Epistle to Glorius and Elusius." These are proofs more than sufficient that the Edict of Donation attributed to Constantine is counterfeit and forged; and therefore Melchior Canus writeth thus of it²: "The lawyers do sufficiently show, that that form of Donation which is attributed to Constantine, and commonly carried about, is feigned and counterfeit, in that they brand it with the disgraceful inscription of chaff³." Eusebius, Ruffinus, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen, Eutropius, Victor, and the other approved authors, who most diligently wrote all the acts of Constantine, do not only pass by this supposed Donation, without making any mention of it, but also deliver, that Constantine, by his last will and testament, so divided the provinces subject to the Roman empire, among his three sons, that all Italy fell to the lot of one of them; which, being so religious a prince, he would not have done, if he had formerly given Italy and all the western part of the empire to the pope. Ammianus Marcellinus reporteth⁴, that Constantius held the sovereignty of Rome, and appointed Leontius to

¹ "Verum est, Constantinum imperatorem tempore Melchiadis papæ fuisse et tunc Christianum, ut per Augustinum in multis locis hoc habetur, et maxime in epistola ad Glorium et Elusium."—Cusan. De Concord. Cathol. Lib. III. cap. 2. [p. 782.]

² "Jurisperiti quæ vulgo circumfertur ejus donationis formula eam commentitiam esse satis indicant, cum paleæ inscriptione denotant. Eusebius, Ruffinus, Theodoritus, Socrates, Sozomenus, Eutropius, Victor, cæterique probæ fidei auctores, qui omnia Constantini gesta scripsere diligentissime, non modo nullam donationis ejus mentionem faciunt, sed tradunt etiam orbem Romanum sic inter tres illius filios distributum, ut Italia uni eorum tota contigerit. Ammianus Marcellinus lib. xv. Constantium urbis dominationem habuisse, et Leontium præfectum ibi constituisse, auctor est. Nonnullos deinceps imperatores Italiæ atque adeo Romanæ imperasse omnes historici memoriæ prodiderunt."—Melchior Canus. [ubi supra.]

³ 'Palea.' Vid. Gratian. Decret. Dist. 96. cap. 14. [Col. 512. Par. 1612.]

⁴ Lib. xv. [cap. 7. § 1.]

be his lieutenant there; and all historians do report that sundry emperors, long after the time of Constantine's supposed Donation, ruled and reigned as sovereign lords in Italy, and even in Rome itself. Pope Agatho, writing to Constantine¹, that called the sixth general council, acknowledgeth that Rome is *imperatoris servilis urbs*, that is, "the emperor's city in all humble and submissive subjection;" and it is most evident² that in the time of Gregory the First the emperor held the city of Rome, and governed it by a lord deputy. But some man, perhaps, will say, that the acts of Sylvester in which this Donation is found, are approved by Gelasius and a synod of bishops, and that therefore we may not doubt of it. This allegation is easily answered. For (as Cusanus³ rightly noteth) it is a very weak and slender confirmation of the acts of Pope Sylvester that is found in Gelasius and the synod of bishops holden by him. For Gelasius saith only, the author of these acts is not known, and that yet they are read by some catholics in the Church of Rome, and many churches by ancient use imitate the same. The writings also (saith he) concerning the invention of the holy cross of our Lord, and some other writings concerning the invention of the head of Saint John Baptist, are truly but novel and late revelations, and yet some catholics read them. But when writings of this kind shall come into the hands of catholics, let that sentence of blessed Paul the apostle be before them, "Prove all things, and hold that which is good⁴." Touching Gratian, in whom this Charter of Donation is now found, Antoninus⁵, archbishop of Florence, noteth that in the old books it was not found. And therefore it is rightly noted and distinguished from other things of more credit by the inscription of

¹ Epist. Agathonis, lecta in Concil. vi. Actione iv. [Labbe, Tom. vii. col. 654, E.]

² "Præfectus urbis Germanus nomine, Gregorii nuntium anticipavit, comprehensumque ac diruptis epistolis, consensum quem populus fecerat imperatori direxit."—Johann. Diac. in Vit. Gregor. Lib. i. cap. 40. [Inter Opp. Gregor. Tom. iv. col. 36. Par. 1705.]

³ Concord. Cathol. Lib. iii. cap. 2. [p. 781.]

⁴ 1 Thess. v. 21.

⁵ "Dubium est de donatione facta ecclesiæ a Constantino, de qua habetur in decretis, Dist. 96. 'Constantinus.' Sed illud caput non habetur in antiquis decretis."—Antonin. Florent. Hist. Part. i. Lib. viii. cap. 2. [§ 8. Tom. i. p. 567. Lugd. 1586.]

palea, that is chaff, because there is no good corn in it; as Platina observeth¹ in the life of John the Seventh; with whom Contius², the author of a preface before the decrees, agreeth; affirming that those things that are so noted were at the first put into the margent only, and so after crept into the text; and that many of them are not found in the most ancient books of decrees. And in his annotations upon that part of the decrees³ where this feigned charter of Constantine is found, insinuateth that this chaff is not in all books of decrees. Touching Isidore, the Magdeburgians⁴ testify that in old copies there is nothing found concerning this supposed Donation, and the like may be thought of Ivo: so that there is no author of any credit that giveth testimony to this Donation; and they that do speak of it speak so differently and uncertainly, that from thence Naclere⁵ gathereth that the whole is but a forged matter, and mere device. For in the decrees⁶ there is mention of a donation of the city of Rome, of all Italy, and other provinces of the West; but in the feigned epistle of Melchiades⁷, and in the decretal of Bonifacius the Eighth, there is no mention but only of the city of Rome⁸; so that though it be not to be doubted but that Con-

¹ "Cum de donatione nihil certi habeatur, paleamque pontificii jurisperiti appellant, quod sine frumento sit, nihilque Constantinianæ elegantiae ac dignitatis habeat, quomodo de confirmatione constabit."—Platina in Vit. Joann. vii. [p. 106. Colon. 1600.]

² Cap. 'Cum enixa.' Dist. v. in Annot. [p. 10. Antv. 1570.]

³ Part. i. Decret. Dist. xcvi. cap. 'Constantinus.' [p. 304.]

⁴ "Cæterum neque Constantinum magnum Romanis episcopis ea donasse quæ referuntur donata, neque formulam illam privilegii hoc sæculo neque aliquot sequentibus esse scriptam, ex multis argumentis animadverti potest. Nam de ea nulla apud probatos auctores expresse fit mentio per aliquot sæcula."—Hist. Eccles. Magdeburg. Cent. iv. cap. 7. [col. 319. Bas. 1624.]

⁵ Chronogr. Vol. ii. Gener. ii. [p. 503, 4. Colon. 1579.]

⁶ Ubi supra.

⁷ Decret. 2 Part. Caus. xii. Qu. 1. cap. 15. [col. 1057.]

⁸ "Non absque miraculo factum esse concipitur ut occasionaliter Constantini monarchæ a Deo provisa, sed curata baptismalibus fomentis infirmitas quandam quasi adjiceret ipsi ecclesiæ firmitatem; in quarto die sui baptismatis una cum omnibus satrapis et universo senatu, optimatibus etiam et cuncto populo in persona beati Silvestri, sibi Romanam concedendo urbem relinquens ab eo et successoribus ejus, per pragmaticum constitutum disponendam esse decernens in ipsa urbe utriusque potestatis monarchiam Romanis pontificibus de-

stantine gave princely gifts unto the Church, and other emperors and princes augmented the same in such sort, that the Church long since had ample possessions, great revenues, and a goodly patrimony in sundry parts of the West; yet I think we may most safely affirm, with Platina, Otho Frisingensis, Cusanus, Valla, Naclerus, Canus, and sundry other, that there never was any such Donation as is imagined, but that both Rome and all Italy, with the western provinces, remained still subject to the emperor, till the time of Pipine the father of Charles the Great, being governed either by the emperors themselves, or by such as they appointed when they lived away and made their abode in other places, as, in process of time, they resided in a manner altogether at Constantinople, made great by Constantine, and better liked of by his successors than Rome itself. Whereupon we read of one Narses¹, the emperor's lieutenant, a good man, and a good governor, who, having vanquished the Goths, ruled the Romans in great peace and quietness for a long time; till, moved with envy, they made complaints of him to the Emperor Justinus, and Sophia his wife, professing that it were better for them to be under the Goths again, than to endure the proud and insolent command of this lieutenant. Upon which complaints the emperor displaced him, and sent one Longinus to succeed him. Which thing so offended Narses, that he called the Lombards into Italy, whose coming made the Greek emperors in time to lose Rome and all Italy. Longinus, the successor of Narses, after he was established in his place (whereas before there were no garrisons in the towns of Italy, but every city was governed by her own magistrates), put garrisons into divers towns, and brought in a new form of government into Rome, and into all Italy, which more afflicted it than all the calamities that it had been subject unto for the space of one hundred and sixty years before, though such and so grievous, that Rome was sometimes left desolate, to be inhabited by wild beasts. This man brought in a new name of dignity, to express the honourable place and office of the chief commander in Italy under the emperor, calling it the exarchate, and him that so ruled the exarch. This exarch remained

clararet."—Bonifac. VIII. Lib. Sext. Decretal. Lib. I. Tit. 6. 'De Electione.' cap. 17. [col. 132. Lugd. 1624.]

¹ Nacler. Vol. II. Gen. xix. xx. [pp. 603, 613.]

at Ravenna, and went not at all to Rome; he appointed no one president over a whole province or country, but left every city to be governed by her own magistrates, whom he called dukes, and made none other difference between Rome and other cities, but that whereas the governors of other places were called dukes, the governor of Rome first placed was called a president, and they that followed him dukes, whence we read of the Roman dukedom. Neither had the Romans, after the times of Narses and Basilius, either consuls or senate lawfully called together, but all their affairs were managed by some Grecian duke, whom the exarch sent unto them. This form of government continued till the time of Leo the Third, who breaking down images in the east parts of the world, and seeking to bring the pope and Christians of the West to do the like, procured himself so great dislike and ill will among them, (the pope persuading them to condemn his commandments in this behalf as unlawful,) that they of Ravenna and Venice began to rebel against him and his exarch, and would have chosen a new emperor, but that the pope (in hope that he would amend) stayed them by his persuasions from so doing. Yet this rebellion proceeded so far¹ that the cities deposed the magistrates set over them by the exarch, and appointed new of their own. The city of Rome slew Marinus Spatharius, that was her duke, and his son Adrian, and chose another. They of Ravenna were divided among themselves; whereupon the exarch was slain; and in the meanwhile the Lombards brought into Italy by Narses, and now grown to be strong, possessed themselves of Bononia, and other places. The emperor hearing of these innovations in Italy², sent another exarch, who sought to appease the Lombards with gifts, and to incite certain Romans against the pope to take away his life. So that the pope was greatly distressed on every side, fearing both the emperor and the Lombards. But being encouraged by the people so to do, he excommunicated the exarch, whom the emperor had sent, and pacified the Lombards, and afterwards wrought a reconciliation between the exarch and himself; and persuaded him to go to Ravenna, and there to make his abode, as other

¹ Idem, Gener. xxv. [p. 654.] Rhegino, Lib. i. [p. 18. Apud Pistor.]

² Naucler. Gener. xxv. [p. 654.]

his predecessors had done. After this the Lombard besiegeth Rome again, and putteth the pope and the inhabitants in great fear, yet did they not send to the emperor for help, by reason of the great dislikes that were between them, as also for that there was little hope of any help to come from him, being scarce able to defend the city of Constantinople from the Saracens, but to Charles Martel, father of Pipine, who by entreaty persuaded the Lombard to remove his siege and go away. After this again, Aistulphus king of the Lombards besieged Ravenna, and took it, and put the Romans into as great a fear as ever they had been in before. Whereupon the pope writeth to the emperor, signifying in what state Rome and all Italy was, and that if he did not presently send aid, they must fall into the hands of Aistulphus. Upon these letters of the pope, the emperor sendeth to Aistulphus to persuade him to desist from invading his countries and territories, but effecteth nothing. And therefore the pope consulteth with the Romans what was fit to be done. Who resolve to send to the emperor and to let him know, that if he would not presently come in person with the forces of the empire to relieve Italy, they must be forced to seek defence and relief elsewhere. According to this resolution, messengers were presently sent to Constantinople, but not returning in time, the Romans were forced to seek to Pipine for help; who came in person, and restored the bishop of Rome to his place from whence he was fled, forced Aistulphus to swear and give pledges to restore all things to him that he had taken away: but he was no sooner gone out of the country, but he did more mischief than ever, whereof Pipine understanding, gathered a new army, and returned into Italy, with a full resolution to subdue this tyrant, and to settle the peace of the Church of Rome. The emperor hearing that the Romans had sought help of Pipine, sendeth to him great gifts and presents, and beseecheth him to restore Ravenna and the exarchate to the empire, whereunto of right it pertained, and not to give them to the Romans or pope. Whereunto Pipine answered: That he was now the second time come into Italy, not for gain, but for his soul's health, and to repress the insolencies of the Lombards, that they might not hurt the Church, and that therefore he meant to take Ravenna and the exarchate, and other parts of Italy out of the Lombard's hand, and to give them to the pope and Ro-

man Church; and so he did. Now the exarchate was divided into two regions, the one named Pentapolis, containing five cities, to wit, Ravenna, Cæsena, Classis, Forum Livii, and Forum Popilii: the other, Æmilia, wherein were Bononia, Rhegium, Parma, Placentia, and whatsoever land there is from the bounds of those of Placentia and Ticine to Adria, and from Adria to Ariminum. But the state of things was not so settled by Pipine, but that Desiderius, who succeeded Aistulphus in the kingdom of the Lombards, began afresh to wrong the Church of Rome again; and therefore in the time of Adrian the pope, Charles the Great was intreated to come into Italy; which thing he willingly yielded to perform, and came to relieve them whom his father before had set free, and rested not till he had subdued the Lombards, and restored to the Church of Rome all that which Pipine had given, confirming his gift with more ample privileges than before; and therefore to show their thankfulness to him, the Romans did him all the honour that possibly they could devise; and a synod was holden in Rome called by Adrian¹, consisting of an hundred fifty and three bishops, religious men and abbots, and Adrian the pope and the bishops assembled in council, with unanimous consent, yielded to Charles right and power to choose the pope, and to order the apostolic see; they granted unto him also the dignity of being a patrician, that is, a nobleman of Rome, and besides all this, decreed that archbishops and bishops in all provinces should receive investiture from him; and that no man should be consecrated a bishop, unless he were first approved and commended by the king, and invested by him: subjecting all such as should dare to go against this decree, to excommunication and confiscation of goods, if they should not speedily repent, and show themselves sorry for so doing. This privilege the French kings enjoy in a sort unto this day, especially in certain provinces of France. After this the second time, Charles the Great was occasioned to come to Rome, by reason of some violences offered to Leo bishop thereof, at what time the bishop of Rome considering that the emperors of Constantinople did hardly hold the title of emperors, that they were able to yield little relief in time of need, and that they did in a sort forsake the western part of the empire, and besides all this, differed in some matters of religion; and on the other side,

¹ Dist. LXIII. cap. 'Adrianus.' [col. 341.]

considering that Charles was a most mighty prince, and one that deserved well of the Church, as Pipine and Martel had done before him, with the consent of the people of Rome, taking from him the title of a patrician, proclaimeth him emperor.

Thus we see Pipine gave certain countries to the pope and Church, and Charles confirmed the same gift. But they did not so give them, but that they retained (as Sigonius noteth¹), *Jus, principatum, et ditionem*, that is, the right, sovereignty, and royalty to themselves and their successors, so that the Romans were to do the emperor service, and pay him tributes, they were by an oath of fealty to oblige themselves unto him, and he² by his princely power might appoint magistrates to judge and rule the people; yet such was the encroaching of the Roman bishops, that they could not endure long to be in this subjection, but sought wholly to cast off the yoke of the emperors. Whereupon Frederick Barbarossa (as Naucerus reporteth³ out of Frisingensis⁴), some differences growing between him and the pope and cities of Italy, inquired of the princes and lawyers in what sort and how far forth the cities of Italy were subject to the empire; and they with one consent did all adjudge unto him all royalties, as coins, tolls, shippings, confirmation of dignities, of judges and consuls, tributes and judgments anciently established, besides such other things as he might require when the empire should stand in need. But the pope alleged at the same time that the emperor might send no ambassadors to Rome without his connivance, and that they of his exchequer might make no collection of money, in the castles, villages, or towns, subject to the pope, but only at that time when first he putteth on the imperial crown in Rome. And Otho Frisingensis addeth⁵, that these articles were proposed to the emperor by the pope's legates, to wit, that no messengers or ambassadors should be sent to the city without the pope's privity, seeing all the magistrates of that town are the officers of Saint Peter, with all royalties; that no money should be collected out of the pope's lordships

¹ De regno Italiae, Lib. iv. [Tom. ii. col. 269. Mediol. 1732.]

² As Lotharius did: Naucler. Vol. ii. Generat. xxviii. [p. 707.]

³ Gener. xxxix. [p. 842.]

⁴ De Gestis Frederici. Lib. ii. c. 5. [p. 182.]

⁵ Radevici Frising. Appen. ad Othonem de Reb. Gestis Frederici. Lib. ii. cap. 30. [Al. Lib. iv. cap. 34. p. 192.]

but only at the time of the emperor's coronation; that the bishops of Italy should only take the oath of fealty, and do no homage to the emperor; and lastly, that the emperor's ambassadors should not challenge any entertainment in bishops' palaces. To these articles¹ the emperor answered in this sort: "I truly desire not the homage of the bishops of Italy, if they please to renounce those royalties that do belong unto us; who, if they willingly hear from the pope, What hast thou to do with the king? they must be content to hear from the emperor also, What hast thou to do with mundane possessions? That our ambassadors are not to be received and entertained, I will easily grant, if any bishop may be found whose palace stands upon his own ground, and not upon ours. But whereas the pope pretendeth that the emperor may send no ambassadors to Rome without his privity, that all magistrates there are the officers of Saint Peter; this matter, I confess, is of moment and consequence, and will require a more grave and mature deliberation. For, seeing by the providence and ordinance of God I am the emperor of Rome, and so called, I shall but only carry a show of a sovereign lord, and have the empty title without the thing, if the sovereignty and command of the city of Rome be taken from me." Thus did the good emperor seek to maintain the right of the empire, yet, out of a good and Christian disposition, was willing to refer all differences between the pope and him to the trial of law or of arbitrement. But the pope would not consent to any such thing; wherein he showed more policy than good disposition, as knowing that he must needs fall in this suit, if the matter came to trial. For it is most evident, that Lotharius appointed magistrates, even in Rome itself, to judge the people; that the nobles of Rome took the oath of fealty to the emperor Ludovicus, father to Lotharius². This oath was taken in the time of Frederick the First, in Verona; the form of the oath was this³: "I do swear that from this time forward I will be faithful and true to my lord Frederick, emperor of Romans, against all men, &c. And that I will never go about to take from him his royalties, &c." These were the differences between Frederick Barbarossa and the pope, and the opposition grew so great and strong, that divers

¹ Ibid.² Supra.³ Radevici Append. ad Othonem. Lib. i. [Al. III. cap. 19. p. 170.]

of the cardinals conspired against the emperor, and gave large sums of money to Adrian the pope to excommunicate him. And this conspiracy was confirmed with oaths, that none should draw back or seek the emperor's favour without the rest. And that if the pope should die, they should choose none but one of the conspiring cardinals to succeed him. But as David said, "They shall curse, but thou shalt bless¹:" so God, that spake by the mouth of David, turned all that these conspirators did to a contrary effect. For it came to pass², that some few days after the pope had denounced excommunication against the emperor at Anagnia, going forth to refresh himself with some few accompanying him, he drank of the water of a certain well, and presently a fly entered into his mouth and stuck so fast in his throat, that by no skill of physicians it could be drawn out, till he had breathed out his last breath. Yet were not the conspirators discouraged by this accident; but after his death the greater part of cardinals chose Roland the chancellor, a professed enemy to the empire and one of the conspirators, in contempt of Frederick and the German nation (though there were some other that chose cardinal Octavian, and named him Victor). This Roland, naming himself Alexander the Third, after he came to the popedom had many dangerous conflicts with the emperor, and was oftentimes put to the worse by him, insomuch that in the end he was forced to disguise himself, and in the habit of a cook to fly to Venice, where he lived for a certain space in base condition; till in the end being known, he was honourably entertained and kindly entreated by the Venetians: which when Frederick understood of, he was greatly displeased with them for entertaining his enemy, and sent his son with a great navy and strong army, by force and violence to fetch him thence. But such was the ill hap of the young prince, that being encountered by the Venetians, he was by them taken prisoner; neither could his deliverance by any means be procured, unless Frederick would come in person to Venice, and seek to be reconciled to the pope. This hard condition the emperor yielded to for his son's sake, went to Venice in person, and was reconciled to the pope upon this condition—that he should restore to the pope the city of

¹ Psalm cix. 28.

² Naucler. Vol. II. Gener. xxxix. [p. 843.]

Rome, and whatsoever belonged to the royalty of it, and that he should do such penance as he should enjoin him: which being yielded unto, he came to the door of Saint Mark's church, and all the people looking on, the pope commanded him to prostrate himself on the ground, and to ask forgiveness, and then, treading on his neck, said, It is written, "Thou shalt go upon the asp and basilisk, and thou shalt tread upon the lion and the dragon¹:" and when Frederick said unto him, *Non tibi sed Petro cujus successor es, pareo*: that is, "I do not thus submit myself to thee, but to Peter:" the pope answered, *Et mihi et Petro*: that is, "Thou shalt do it both unto me and unto Peter." This story, so lively describing the insolency and pride of the pope, which hitherto hath gone for current, is now by certain Romanists called in question (so little do they regard their own historians, and so freely may they cast aside whatsoever standeth in their way). Howsoever, we see how mainly the popes did strive, after they had gotten a kind of civil dominion under the emperors, to cast off their yoke wholly; and, not content therewith, sought to be lords also over the emperors, and to make them acknowledge that they hold their empire from them. How and upon what occasion Leo the Third, with the consent of the people of Rome, proclaimed and anointed Charles the Great, king of France by inheritance and of Italy by conquest, and emperor of Rome, I have showed before. Yet (as Sabellicus noteth²) the opinions of men in the world were greatly altered and changed after this new inauguration; for whereas before the empire was thought to be from heaven and the gift of God, now many began to think it to be the gift of the pope³. Whereupon we read that Adrian the Fourth, upon the report of some villanies offered to the bishop of Landa in the parts of Germany, as he returned from Rome, and not so pursued, sought out, and revenged as was expected, by Frederick Barbarossa, then emperor; writeth unto him, and marvelling at his negligence in revenging wrongs offered to men of the Church, putteth him in mind what benefits he had received

¹ Psalm xci. 13.

² Sabell. Ennead. viii. Lib. viii. [Ad fin. Tom. ii. col. 598. Bas. 1560.]

³ Which Ockam, Dial. Lib. i. Tract. ii. Part. iii. proveth to be false and heretical by many reasons. [cap. 18. et sqq. p. 885. &c. apud Goldast.]

from him and the Church of Rome, as, namely, the fulness of imperial dignity and honour, and the crown appertaining thereunto; and professeth that he would have been willing to have conferred greater benefits than these upon him, knowing right well how much good he might do unto the Church¹. This letter being brought to the emperor by two cardinals, Bernard and Roland, offended the emperor and princes exceedingly, especially in that it was said in the letter that the fulness of dignity and honour was conferred upon the emperor by the pope, and that he had received the imperial crown of his hand, and that it would not grieve him if he had received greater benefits of his hand². They which heard this letter read were induced to make a strict construction of the words, and to think the pope uttered them in the sense which they conceived, because they knew well that certain Romanists had not feared to affirm that the emperors had hitherto possessed the empire of Rome and the kingdom of Italy by the pope's gift, and that they had not only uttered such words, but that by writing they had affirmed the same, and by painting lively represented it, that so it might be transmitted and sent over to posterities. For in the palace of Lateran they had painted the manner of Lotharius the emperor's receiving the crown of the pope, and written over it these words: *Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores, post homo fit papæ sumit quo dante coronam*. That is, "The king doth come before the gate, first swearing to the city's state: the pope's man then doth he become, and of his gift doth take the crown." This painting and superscription being reported to the emperor the year before, when he was near the city, by certain faithful and trusty subjects of his, greatly displeased him. But the pope, perceiving his dislike, promised that both the writing and the painting should be taken away, that it might give no occasion of contention and discord. These Romish practices making the emperor and his nobles to understand the words of the pope's letter in the worst sense, caused the message of these cardinals to be very offensive, and a general murmuring against them was heard among the princes: which growing more loud, and being

¹ Radevicus Frising. in Append. ad Othon. Lib. i. [Al. III.] cap. 9. [p. 165.]

² Ibid. cap. 10. [p. 166.]

heard and discerned by the legates, one of them adventured in the quarrel of his master to demand of whom the emperor hath his empire, if he have it not of the lord pope? Which speech of the cardinal so enraged the princes, that one of them (to wit, Otto the county palatine of Boiaria) had with his sword run him through, had not Frederick the emperor interposed his authority, and pacified the present rage. The emperor seeing in what terms things stood, took the best course he could for the security of the legates, and commanded that they should presently be had to their lodgings, and that the next morning they should be gone, and return directly to him that sent them, and not to wander up and down in the territories of bishops and abbots; and as he thus happily dispatched them away in safety, so after they were gone (providently by letters) he caused it to be made known throughout the whole empire what had passed between him and the pope. The tenor of his letters was this: "Whereas the Divine power, from which all power proceedeth both in heaven and earth, hath committed to us, his anointed, the rule of the kingdom and empire; and ordained that by imperial arms we should preserve the peace of the Churches, we are forced, not without great grief of heart, to complain unto you, that from the head of the holy Church (in which Christ imprinted the character of his peace and love) the causes of dissension, the seminary of evils, and the poison of a most pestiferous disease, do seem to flow; by means whereof, if God turn not away this evil, there is danger lest the unity betwixt the priesthood and kingdom be broken, and a schism follow. For of late, as we were in the court of Bisuntium, consulting about things concerning the honour of the empire and good of the Churches, there came unto us certain legates from the pope, who professed to bring such a message as tended greatly to the increase of the honour of the empire. But when we had the first day honourably entertained them (as the manner is), and the second day sat with our princes to hear their message, they (as it were), puffed up by reason of the mammon of iniquity, out of the height of their pride, out of the haughtiness of their arrogant minds, and out of the execrable elation of their swelling hearts, presented unto us an embassage contained in letters written by the pope, the tenor whereof was, that we should always have before the eyes of our mind in what sort the

lord pope hath conferred upon us the ensign of the imperial crown, and that yet, notwithstanding, it would no way repent him if he had done us greater favours, and we had received more benefits of him. These things not only much affected, but so moved the princes, and enraged them in such sort, that if we had not stayed them by our princely authority, the two wicked priests (the legates) had never returned alive. Wherefore, seeing they had many schedules sealed to be written in at their pleasure, by which (as formerly they were wont to do) they might scatter the poison of their iniquity throughout all the Churches of the German kingdom; make bare and naked the holy altars, and carry away with them the vessels of the house of God as a prey; that they might proceed no farther in mischief, we commanded them, without wandering or going aside, to return the same way they came. For, whereas we have our kingdom by the election of the princes from God only, who in the passion of his Son subjected the world to two swords, and the apostle Peter informed the world with the same doctrine, saying, ‘Fear God and honour the king¹;’ we are well assured, that whosoever shall say that we receive our imperial crown as a benefit from the pope, he is contrary to the institution of God, the doctrine of blessed Peter, and is a liar: and therefore our hope is, that you will not suffer the honour of the empire (which hath continued from the constitution of the city, and the institution of Christian religion, inviolable till our times) to be diminished by such unheard-of novelties and presumptuous pride. But howsoever know ye, that we will rather run into peril of death itself than suffer such a shameful confusion to fall out in our times.” After the return of the cardinals, and their complaints made, the pope wrote letters to the archbishops and bishops of Germany², telling them with what indignity the emperor dismissed his legates, and how he forbad any to come to Rome out of his kingdom; and prayed them to advise him better, and to let him know that the Church (which is builded upon a most firm and sure rock) shall continue for ever, howsoever it may be shaken with winds and tempests. The bishops of Germany having received these letters from the pope³, writ back unto him, that howsoever the Church cannot

¹ 1 Pet. ii. 17.

² Radevic. ubi supra, cap. 15. [p. 168.]

³ Cap. 16. [p. 169.]

be moved, yet they were greatly shaken by reason of these differences between him and the emperor; and tell him that the words of his letter were such as that neither the emperor and princes could endure them, nor they knew how to defend them, as being strange and unheard of before these times. Notwithstanding, they let him know, that after the receipt of his letters, they communed with the emperor about these affairs, and received from him such an answer as beseemed a catholic prince, to wit, that there are two things whereby his empire must be swayed; the laws of emperors, and the use and custom of his ancestors. These limits he is resolved not to pass, and whatsoever will not stand with these he will utterly refuse and reject: he is willing to give all due reverence unto his ghostly father, but that he ascribeth the crown of his empire to the Divine favour only, the first voice in the election to the archbishop of Mentz, and the rest to the other princes in order; that he acknowledgeth to have received the unction of a king from the archbishop of Coleyn, and the supreme unction, which is that of an emperor, from the pope; and that whatsoever is besides these is more than enough, and proceedeth from that which is evil; that he had not sent away the cardinals in contempt, but forbad them to proceed any further with such writings as they had, tending to the dishonour and scandal of the empire; and that he had not restrained the going of men into Italy upon necessary occasions, to be allowed by their bishops, nor simply inhibited the coming of men from thence, but that his meaning was to meet certain abuses, whereby the Churches of his kingdom had been grieved, impoverished, and oppressed; all discipline of men living retired and in cloisters utterly overthrown. Lastly, that God having exalted his Church, by means of the empire, in the head city of the world, it should not be by any means that the Church in the head city of the world should overthrow the state of the empire; that the matter began with painting, that it proceeded from painting to writing, that the writing now begins to be urged as good authority, but that he will not suffer it, nor endure it so to be, being resolved first to lose his crown before he give any consent to the abasing of the crown of the empire in such sort: and therefore requireth the paintings to be rased out, and the writings to be recalled, that such monuments of

enmity between the kingdom and the priesthood may not remain; and hereupon they beseech the pope by new letters to mollify that which was too hard, and to sweeten that which was too sour, in the former. This so wise, just, and reasonable an answer of the German bishops, prevailed so far with the pope¹, that he sent other legates of a milder spirit and better temper to the emperor, with new letters, wherein he sought to qualify whatsoever was offensive in the former; for touching that he wrote of the benefit the emperor had received of him², (which so highly displeased the emperor, supposing that he meant that he had received the imperial crown as a mere favour or good turn from him,) he answered, that however the word benefit be taken in another sense sometimes, yet he used it in that signification which it hath by original institution and first imposition. So that the word benefit, being compounded of two simple words, *bene* and *factum*, signifieth a good fact, or a thing well done, and in this sense his setting of the crown upon the emperor's head might be called a benefit, not as being a mere favour or good turn, but for that it was well and honourably done of him, to set the ensign of imperial majesty and power upon the head of him to whom such power pertained; and so were things at that time pacified by the good endeavour of the cardinals and by this mild letter of the pope. But afterwards they brake out again. Whereupon the pope wrote in this sort to the emperor³: "Adrian the bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Frederick the Roman emperor, greeting and apostolical blessing. The divine law, as it promised long life to them that honour their parents, so doth it pronounce the sentence of death against them that curse father or mother. For we are taught by the voice of truth, that whosoever exalteth himself shall be brought low. Wherefore, son beloved in the Lord, we do not a little marvel that you seem not to give so much reverence to blessed Peter and to the holy Church of Rome as you ought to do. For in your letters written to us you put your name before ours; wherein you incur the note of insolency, that I say not arrogancy. What shall I say of the fealty you promised and sware to blessed Peter? how do you observe it, when you require of

¹ Cap. 17. [p. 169.]

² Cap. 22. [p. 171.]

³ Appendix vetusti scriptoris ad Radevicum in fine hist. Othonis Frisingensis: Naucner. Vol. II. Gener. xxxix. [p. 839.]

them who are gods, and the sons of the Most High, to wit bishops, the doing of homage unto you, and exact fealty of them, inclosing their sacred hands in your hands, and manifestly opposing yourself against us, shut not only the doors of the churches, but the gates of the cities of your kingdom also, against our cardinals sent as legates unto you from our own side? Repent, repent therefore, we advise thee: of us thou receivedst thy consecration, and therefore take heed lest, affecting things denied unto thee, thou lose that which is yielded to thee." To this letter of the pope the worthy emperor answered in this sort¹: "Frederick by the grace of God emperor of Romans, to Adrian bishop of the catholic Church, wishing unto him a firm adhering and cleaving to all those things which Jesus began to do and speak. The law of justice giveth to every one that which is his own. Neither do we offend in this behalf; for we derogate nothing from our parents, but give unto them in this our imperial state all due honour, to wit, to those our noble progenitors, from whom we received the dignity of our kingdom, and our crown, and not from the pope. Had Sylvester bishop of Rome any thing pertaining to royal state and dignity in the time of Constantine? was not liberty restored to the Church, and peace, by his means? And hath not your popedom received all such royal dignities as it now enjoyeth from princes? And why then is it so much disliked, that when we write unto the bishop of Rome, by ancient right, and after the old manner, we put our name before his, and according unto the rule of justice, permit him writing unto us to do the like? Turn over the histories and monuments of antiquity, and if you have not yet observed it, you shall there find that which we avouch; and why should we not require homage and the performance of other duties due from subjects to princes, of them who are gods by adoption, and yet think it no disparagement to hold things pertaining to our royal state? especially, seeing he who was author and beginner both of your dignity and ours, who never received any thing of any mortal king, but gave all good things unto all, paid tribute unto Cæsar for himself and Peter, and gave you an example to do the like. Either therefore let them put from them the things they hold of us, or if they think it behooveful to retain and keep them still, let them

¹ Ibidem.

in the life of Mark, Ludovicus Vives, in his book *De Corruptis Disciplinis*¹, and Alciat², all flatly denying and rejecting this report: and he hath all ancient writers of that age passing it over in silence; who would never have omitted it, if they had known of any such thing, and would undoubtedly have known it, if there had been any such thing. Touching his baptism, all the ancient historians, Hierome³, Eusebius⁴, Socrates⁵, Theodoritus⁶, Sozomen⁷, Cassiodorus⁸, Pomponius Lætus, and others of that rank, affirm that he was baptized by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, a little before his death, and not by Sylvester. The author of the Pontifical, who is full of fables, the feigned charter of Constantine's Donation, and some late writers, deceived by these late forgeries, affirm

¹ "Quale est in res sacras hanc quoque licentiam mentiendi irrepsisse, seu potius aperte esse invectam, ut quæ traduntur de lepra Constantini," &c.—Ludovic. Vives, De Caus. Corrupt. Art. Lib. II. [Tom. I. p. 371. Bas. 1555.]

² "Lepra nunquam laborasse eum idoneos auctores usquam legi: sed ejus nominis Constantinum quintum cognomento Copronymum: unde fortasse æquivocatione nominis error inductus: nam quæ nomine Constantini circumfertur confessio eodem vitio laborat."—Alciat. Parerg. Jur. Lib. VII. cap. 19. [Tom. IV. col. 475. Bas. 1582.]

³ "Constantinus extremo suæ vitæ tempore ab Eusebio Nicomediensi episcopo baptizatus in Arianum dogma declinat."—Hieron. in Chronico. [Tom. VIII. col. 789.]

⁴ "Ἐπειδὴ εἰς ἔννοιαν ἤκει τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς καθάρσεως τοῦτον εἶναι καιρὸν τῶν ποτὲ αὐτῷ πεπλημμελημένων δεῖν ᾤετο· ὅσα οἷα θνητῷ διαμαρτεῖν ἐπῆλθε ταῦτα ἀπορρύψασθαι τῆς ψυχῆς λόγων ἀπορρήτων δυνάμει σωτηρίῳ γε λόγῳ λουτροῦ πιστεύσας. Τοῦτό τοι διανοηθεὶς γόνυ κλίνας ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἱκέτης ἐγίνετο τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ ἐξομολογούμενος· ἔνθα δὲ καὶ πρῶτον τῶν διὰ χειροθεσίας εὐχῶν ἡξιούτο· μεταβὰς δ' ἔνθεν ἐπὶ προάστειον τῶν Νικομηδέων ἀφικνέεται πόλεως· κἀνταῦθα συγκαλέσας τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, κ.τ.λ."—Euseb. De Vit. Constant. Lib. IV. [cap. 61. p. 660. Cantabr. 1720.]

⁵ "Ἐπεὶ δὲ σφοδροτέρου τοῦ νοσήματος ἦσθετο τὰ μὲν λουτρὰ ὑπερέθετο· ἀπαίρει δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλενουπόλεως εἰς τὴν Νικομήδειαν· κακεῖ ἐν προαστείῳ διάγων τοῦ Χριστιανικοῦ μεταλαμβάνει βαπτίσματος."—Socrat. H. E. [I. 39.]

⁶ "Ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ τῆς Βιθυνίας διάγων ἡρρώστησε. Τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης βιότητος ἄδηλον ἐπιστάμενος τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος τὸ δῶρον ἐδέξατο."—Theodoret. H. E. I. 31.

⁷ "Χαλεπώτερον διατεθεὶς διεκομίσθη εἰς Νικομήδειαν, ἔνθα δὲ ἐν προαστείῳ διάγων ἐμνήθη τὴν ἱερὰν βάπτισιν."—Sozom. H. E. [II. 34.]

⁸ "Nicomediæ in suburbano sacri baptismatis donis initiatus est."—Cassiodor. Hist. Tripart. [Lib. III. cap. 12.]

that he was first converted to Christianity by Sylvester, bishop of Rome, and by him baptized, which by no means can be true; it being most certain he was a Christian in the time of Melchiades, Sylvester's predecessor. "It is most certainly true," saith Cusanus¹, "that Constantine the emperor was a Christian in the time of Melchiades the pope, as it appeareth by Austin in divers places, especially in his Epistle to Glorius and Elusius." These are proofs more than sufficient that the Edict of Donation attributed to Constantine is counterfeit and forged; and therefore Melchior Canus writeth thus of it²: "The lawyers do sufficiently show, that that form of Donation which is attributed to Constantine, and commonly carried about, is feigned and counterfeit, in that they brand it with the disgraceful inscription of chaff³." Eusebius, Ruffinus, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen, Eutropius, Victor, and the other approved authors, who most diligently wrote all the acts of Constantine, do not only pass by this supposed Donation, without making any mention of it, but also deliver, that Constantine, by his last will and testament, so divided the provinces subject to the Roman empire, among his three sons, that all Italy fell to the lot of one of them; which, being so religious a prince, he would not have done, if he had formerly given Italy and all the western part of the empire to the pope. Ammianus Marcellinus reporteth⁴, that Constantius held the sovereignty of Rome, and appointed Leontius to

¹ "Verum est, Constantinum imperatorem tempore Melchiadis papæ fuisse et tunc Christianum, ut per Augustinum in multis locis hoc habetur, et maxime in epistola ad Glorium et Elusium."—Cusan. De Concord. Cathol. Lib. III. cap. 2. [p. 782.]

² "Jurisperiti quæ vulgo circumfertur ejus donationis formula eam commentitiam esse satis indicant, cum paleæ inscriptione denotant. Eusebius, Ruffinus, Theodoritus, Socrates, Sozomenus, Eutropius, Victor, cæterique probæ fidei auctores, qui omnia Constantini gesta scripsere diligentissime, non modo nullam donationis ejus mentionem faciunt, sed tradunt etiam orbem Romanum sic inter tres illius filios distributum, ut Italia uni eorum tota contigerit. Ammianus Marcellinus lib. xv. Constantium urbis dominationem habuisse, et Leontium præfectum ibi constituisse, auctor est. Nonnullos deinceps imperatores Italiæ atque adeo Romanæ imperasse omnes historici memoriæ prædiderunt."—Melchior Canus. [ubi supra.]

³ 'Palea.' Vid. Gratian. Decret. Dist. 96. cap. 14. [Col. 512. Par. 1612.]

⁴ Lib. xv. [cap. 7. § 1.]

be his lieutenant there; and all historians do report that sundry emperors, long after the time of Constantine's supposed Donation, ruled and reigned as sovereign lords in Italy, and even in Rome itself. Pope Agatho, writing to Constantine¹, that called the sixth general council, acknowledgeth that Rome is *imperatoris servilis urbs*, that is, "the emperor's city in all humble and submissive subjection;" and it is most evident² that in the time of Gregory the First the emperor held the city of Rome, and governed it by a lord deputy. But some man, perhaps, will say, that the acts of Sylvester in which this Donation is found, are approved by Gelasius and a synod of bishops, and that therefore we may not doubt of it. This allegation is easily answered. For (as Cusanus³ rightly noteth) it is a very weak and slender confirmation of the acts of Pope Sylvester that is found in Gelasius and the synod of bishops holden by him. For Gelasius saith only, the author of these acts is not known, and that yet they are read by some catholics in the Church of Rome, and many churches by ancient use imitate the same. The writings also (saith he) concerning the invention of the holy cross of our Lord, and some other writings concerning the invention of the head of Saint John Baptist, are truly but novel and late revelations, and yet some catholics read them. But when writings of this kind shall come into the hands of catholics, let that sentence of blessed Paul the apostle be before them, "Prove all things, and hold that which is good⁴." Touching Gratian, in whom this Charter of Donation is now found, Antoninus⁵, archbishop of Florence, noteth that in the old books it was not found. And therefore it is rightly noted and distinguished from other things of more credit by the inscription of

¹ Epist. Agathonis, lecta in Concil. vi. Actione iv. [Labbe, Tom. vii. col. 654, E.]

² "Præfectus urbis Germanus nomine, Gregorii nuntium anticipavit, comprehensumque ac diruptis epistolis, consensum quem populus fecerat imperatori direxit."—Johann. Diac. in Vit. Gregor. Lib. i. cap. 40. [Inter Opp. Gregor. Tom. iv. col. 36. Par. 1705.]

³ Concord. Cathol. Lib. iii. cap. 2. [p. 781.]

⁴ 1 Thess. v. 21.

⁵ "Dubium est de donatione facta ecclesiæ a Constantino, de qua habetur in decretis, Dist. 96. 'Constantinus.' Sed illud caput non habetur in antiquis decretis."—Antonin. Florent. Hist. Part. i. Lib. viii. cap. 2. [§ 8. Tom. i. p. 567. Lugd. 1586.]

palea, that is chaff, because there is no good corn in it; as Platina observeth¹ in the life of John the Seventh; with whom Contius², the author of a preface before the decrees, agreeth; affirming that those things that are so noted were at the first put into the margent only, and so after crept into the text; and that many of them are not found in the most ancient books of decrees. And in his annotations upon that part of the decrees³ where this feigned charter of Constantine is found, insinuateth that this chaff is not in all books of decrees. Touching Isidore, the Magdeburgians⁴ testify that in old copies there is nothing found concerning this supposed Donation, and the like may be thought of Ivo: so that there is no author of any credit that giveth testimony to this Donation; and they that do speak of it speak so differently and uncertainly, that from thence Naclere⁵ gathereth that the whole is but a forged matter, and mere device. For in the decrees⁶ there is mention of a donation of the city of Rome, of all Italy, and other provinces of the West; but in the feigned epistle of Melchiades⁷, and in the decretal of Bonifacius the Eighth, there is no mention but only of the city of Rome⁸; so that though it be not to be doubted but that Con-

¹ "Cum de donatione nihil certi habeatur, paleamque pontificii jurisperiti appellant, quod sine frumento sit, nihilque Constantinianæ elegantiae ac dignitatis habeat, quomodo de confirmatione constabit."—Platina in Vit. Joann. vii. [p. 106. Colon. 1600.]

² Cap. 'Cum enixa.' Dist. v. in Annot. [p. 10. Antv. 1570.]

³ Part. I. Decret. Dist. xcvi. cap. 'Constantinus.' [p. 304.]

⁴ "Cæterum neque Constantinum magnum Romanis episcopis ea donasse quæ referuntur donata, neque formulam illam privilegii hoc sæculo neque aliquot sequentibus esse scriptam, ex multis argumentis animadverti potest. Nam de ea nulla apud probatos auctores expresse fit mentio per aliquot sæcula."—Hist. Eccles. Magdeburg. Cent. iv. cap. 7. [col. 319. Bas. 1624.]

⁵ Chronogr. Vol. ii. Gener. ii. [p. 503, 4. Colon. 1579.]

⁶ Ubi supra.

⁷ Decret. 2 Part. Caus. xii. Qu. 1. cap. 15. [col. 1057.]

⁸ "Non absque miraculo factum esse concipitur ut occasionaliter Constantini monarchæ a Deo provisa, sed curata baptismalibus fomentis infirmitas quandam quasi adjiceret ipsi ecclesiæ firmitatem; in quarto die sui baptismatis una cum omnibus satrapis et universo senatu, optimatibus etiam et cuncto populo in persona beati Silvestri, sibi Romanam concedendo urbem relinquens ab eo et successoribus ejus, per pragmaticum constitutum disponendam esse decernens in ipsa urbe utriusque potestatis monarchiam Romanis pontificibus de-

stantine gave princely gifts unto the Church, and other emperors and princes augmented the same in such sort, that the Church long since had ample possessions, great revenues, and a goodly patrimony in sundry parts of the West; yet I think we may most safely affirm, with Platina, Otho Frisingensis, Cusanus, Valla, Nauclerus, Canus, and sundry other, that there never was any such Donation as is imagined, but that both Rome and all Italy, with the western provinces, remained still subject to the emperor, till the time of Pipine the father of Charles the Great, being governed either by the emperors themselves, or by such as they appointed when they lived away and made their abode in other places, as, in process of time, they resided in a manner altogether at Constantinople, made great by Constantine, and better liked of by his successors than Rome itself. Whereupon we read of one Narses¹, the emperor's lieutenant, a good man, and a good governor, who, having vanquished the Goths, ruled the Romans in great peace and quietness for a long time; till, moved with envy, they made complaints of him to the Emperor Justinus, and Sophia his wife, professing that it were better for them to be under the Goths again, than to endure the proud and insolent command of this lieutenant. Upon which complaints the emperor displaced him, and sent one Longinus to succeed him. Which thing so offended Narses, that he called the Lombards into Italy, whose coming made the Greek emperors in time to lose Rome and all Italy. Longinus, the successor of Narses, after he was established in his place (whereas before there were no garrisons in the towns of Italy, but every city was governed by her own magistrates), put garrisons into divers towns, and brought in a new form of government into Rome, and into all Italy, which more afflicted it than all the calamities that it had been subject unto for the space of one hundred and sixty years before, though such and so grievous, that Rome was sometimes left desolate, to be inhabited by wild beasts. This man brought in a new name of dignity, to express the honourable place and office of the chief commander in Italy under the emperor, calling it the exarchate, and him that so ruled the exarch. This exarch remained

clararet."—Bonifac. VIII. Lib. Sext. Decretal. Lib. I. Tit. 6. 'De Electione.' cap. 17. [col. 132. Lugd. 1624.]

¹ Naucler. Vol. II. Gen. xix. xx. [pp. 603, 613.]

at Ravenna, and went not at all to Rome; he appointed no one president over a whole province or country, but left every city to be governed by her own magistrates, whom he called dukes, and made none other difference between Rome and other cities, but that whereas the governors of other places were called dukes, the governor of Rome first placed was called a president, and they that followed him dukes, whence we read of the Roman dukedom. Neither had the Romans, after the times of Narses and Basilius, either consuls or senate lawfully called together, but all their affairs were managed by some Grecian duke, whom the exarch sent unto them. This form of government continued till the time of Leo the Third, who breaking down images in the east parts of the world, and seeking to bring the pope and Christians of the West to do the like, procured himself so great dislike and ill will among them, (the pope persuading them to condemn his commandments in this behalf as unlawful,) that they of Ravenna and Venice began to rebel against him and his exarch, and would have chosen a new emperor, but that the pope (in hope that he would amend) stayed them by his persuasions from so doing. Yet this rebellion proceeded so far¹ that the cities deposed the magistrates set over them by the exarch, and appointed new of their own. The city of Rome slew Marinus Spatharius, that was her duke, and his son Adrian, and chose another. They of Ravenna were divided among themselves; whereupon the exarch was slain; and in the meanwhile the Lombards brought into Italy by Narses, and now grown to be strong, possessed themselves of Bononia, and other places. The emperor hearing of these innovations in Italy², sent another exarch, who sought to appease the Lombards with gifts, and to incite certain Romans against the pope to take away his life. So that the pope was greatly distressed on every side, fearing both the emperor and the Lombards. But being encouraged by the people so to do, he excommunicated the exarch, whom the emperor had sent, and pacified the Lombards, and afterwards wrought a reconciliation between the exarch and himself; and persuaded him to go to Ravenna, and there to make his abode, as other

¹ Idem, Gener. xxv. [p. 654.] Rhegino, Lib. i. [p. 18. Apud Pistor.]

² Naucler. Gener. xxv. [p. 654.]

his predecessors had done. After this the Lombard besiegeth Rome again, and putteth the pope and the inhabitants in great fear, yet did they not send to the emperor for help, by reason of the great dislikes that were between them, as also for that there was little hope of any help to come from him, being scarce able to defend the city of Constantinople from the Saracens, but to Charles Martel, father of Pipine, who by entreaty persuaded the Lombard to remove his siege and go away. After this again, Aistulphus king of the Lombards besieged Ravenna, and took it, and put the Romans into as great a fear as ever they had been in before. Whereupon the pope writeth to the emperor, signifying in what state Rome and all Italy was, and that if he did not presently send aid, they must fall into the hands of Aistulphus. Upon these letters of the pope, the emperor sendeth to Aistulphus to persuade him to desist from invading his countries and territories, but effecteth nothing. And therefore the pope consulteth with the Romans what was fit to be done. Who resolve to send to the emperor and to let him know, that if he would not presently come in person with the forces of the empire to relieve Italy, they must be forced to seek defence and relief elsewhere. According to this resolution, messengers were presently sent to Constantinople, but not returning in time, the Romans were forced to seek to Pipine for help; who came in person, and restored the bishop of Rome to his place from whence he was fled, forced Aistulphus to swear and give pledges to restore all things to him that he had taken away: but he was no sooner gone out of the country, but he did more mischief than ever, whereof Pipine understanding, gathered a new army, and returned into Italy, with a full resolution to subdue this tyrant, and to settle the peace of the Church of Rome. The emperor hearing that the Romans had sought help of Pipine, sendeth to him great gifts and presents, and beseecheth him to restore Ravenna and the exarchate to the empire, whereunto of right it pertained, and not to give them to the Romans or pope. Whereunto Pipine answered: That he was now the second time come into Italy, not for gain, but for his soul's health, and to repress the insolencies of the Lombards, that they might not hurt the Church, and that therefore he meant to take Ravenna and the exarchate, and other parts of Italy out of the Lombard's hand, and to give them to the pope and Ro-

man Church ; and so he did. Now the exarchate was divided into two regions, the one named Pentapolis, containing five cities, to wit, Ravenna, Cæsena, Classis, Forum Livii, and Forum Popilii : the other, Æmilia, wherein were Bononia, Rhegium, Parma, Placentia, and whatsoever land there is from the bounds of those of Placentia and Ticine to Adria, and from Adria to Ariminum. But the state of things was not so settled by Pipine, but that Desiderius, who succeeded Aistulphus in the kingdom of the Lombards, began afresh to wrong the Church of Rome again ; and therefore in the time of Adrian the pope, Charles the Great was intreated to come into Italy ; which thing he willingly yielded to perform, and came to relieve them whom his father before had set free, and rested not till he had subdued the Lombards, and restored to the Church of Rome all that which Pipine had given, confirming his gift with more ample privileges than before ; and therefore to show their thankfulness to him, the Romans did him all the honour that possibly they could devise ; and a synod was holden in Rome called by Adrian¹, consisting of an hundred fifty and three bishops, religious men and abbots, and Adrian the pope and the bishops assembled in council, with unanimous consent, yielded to Charles right and power to choose the pope, and to order the apostolic see ; they granted unto him also the dignity of being a patrician, that is, a nobleman of Rome, and besides all this, decreed that archbishops and bishops in all provinces should receive investiture from him ; and that no man should be consecrated a bishop, unless he were first approved and commended by the king, and invested by him : subjecting all such as should dare to go against this decree, to excommunication and confiscation of goods, if they should not speedily repent, and show themselves sorry for so doing. This privilege the French kings enjoy in a sort unto this day, especially in certain provinces of France. After this the second time, Charles the Great was occasioned to come to Rome, by reason of some violences offered to Leo bishop thereof, at what time the bishop of Rome considering that the emperors of Constantinople did hardly hold the title of emperors, that they were able to yield little relief in time of need, and that they did in a sort forsake the western part of the empire, and besides all this, differed in some matters of religion ; and on the other side,

¹ Dist. LXIII. cap. 'Adrianus.' [col. 341.]

considering that Charles was a most mighty prince, and one that deserved well of the Church, as Pipine and Martel had done before him, with the consent of the people of Rome, taking from him the title of a patrician, proclaimeth him emperor.

Thus we see Pipine gave certain countries to the pope and Church, and Charles confirmed the same gift. But they did not so give them, but that they retained (as Sigonius noteth¹), *Jus, principatum, et ditionem*, that is, the right, sovereignty, and royalty to themselves and their successors, so that the Romans were to do the emperor service, and pay him tributes, they were by an oath of fealty to oblige themselves unto him, and he² by his princely power might appoint magistrates to judge and rule the people; yet such was the encroaching of the Roman bishops, that they could not endure long to be in this subjection, but sought wholly to cast off the yoke of the emperors. Whereupon Frederick Barbarossa (as Naucerus reporteth³ out of Frisingensis⁴), some differences growing between him and the pope and cities of Italy, inquired of the princes and lawyers in what sort and how far forth the cities of Italy were subject to the empire; and they with one consent did all adjudge unto him all royalties, as coins, tolls, shippings, confirmation of dignities, of judges and consuls, tributes and judgments anciently established, besides such other things as he might require when the empire should stand in need. But the pope alleged at the same time that the emperor might send no ambassadors to Rome without his connivance, and that they of his exchequer might make no collection of money, in the castles, villages, or towns, subject to the pope, but only at that time when first he putteth on the imperial crown in Rome. And Otho Frisingensis addeth⁵, that these articles were proposed to the emperor by the pope's legates, to wit, that no messengers or ambassadors should be sent to the city without the pope's privity, seeing all the magistrates of that town are the officers of Saint Peter, with all royalties; that no money should be collected out of the pope's lordships

¹ De regno Italiae, Lib. iv. [Tom. ii. col. 269. Mediol. 1732.]

² As Lotharius did: Naucerus. Vol. ii. Generat. xxviii. [p. 707.]

³ Gener. xxxix. [p. 842.]

⁴ De Gestis Frederici. Lib. ii. c. 5. [p. 182.]

⁵ Radevici Frising. Appen. ad Othonem de Reb. Gestis Frederici. Lib. ii. cap. 30. [Al. Lib. iv. cap. 34. p. 192.]

but only at the time of the emperor's coronation; that the bishops of Italy should only take the oath of fealty, and do no homage to the emperor; and lastly, that the emperor's ambassadors should not challenge any entertainment in bishops' palaces. To these articles¹ the emperor answered in this sort: "I truly desire not the homage of the bishops of Italy, if they please to renounce those royalties that do belong unto us; who, if they willingly hear from the pope, What hast thou to do with the king? they must be content to hear from the emperor also, What hast thou to do with mundane possessions? That our ambassadors are not to be received and entertained, I will easily grant, if any bishop may be found whose palace stands upon his own ground, and not upon ours. But whereas the pope pretendeth that the emperor may send no ambassadors to Rome without his privity, that all magistrates there are the officers of Saint Peter; this matter, I confess, is of moment and consequence, and will require a more grave and mature deliberation. For, seeing by the providence and ordinance of God I am the emperor of Rome, and so called, I shall but only carry a show of a sovereign lord, and have the empty title without the thing, if the sovereignty and command of the city of Rome be taken from me." Thus did the good emperor seek to maintain the right of the empire, yet, out of a good and Christian disposition, was willing to refer all differences between the pope and him to the trial of law or of arbitrement. But the pope would not consent to any such thing; wherein he showed more policy than good disposition, as knowing that he must needs fall in this suit, if the matter came to trial. For it is most evident, that Lotharius appointed magistrates, even in Rome itself, to judge the people; that the nobles of Rome took the oath of fealty to the emperor Ludovicus, father to Lotharius². This oath was taken in the time of Frederick the First, in Verona; the form of the oath was this³: "I do swear that from this time forward I will be faithful and true to my lord Frederick, emperor of Romans, against all men, &c. And that I will never go about to take from him his royalties, &c." These were the differences between Frederick Barbarossa and the pope, and the opposition grew so great and strong, that divers

¹ Ibid.² Supra.³ Radevici Append. ad Othonem. Lib. I. [Al. III. cap. 19. p. 170.]

of the cardinals conspired against the emperor, and gave large sums of money to Adrian the pope to excommunicate him. And this conspiracy was confirmed with oaths, that none should draw back or seek the emperor's favour without the rest. And that if the pope should die, they should choose none but one of the conspiring cardinals to succeed him. But as David said, "They shall curse, but thou shalt bless¹:" so God, that spake by the mouth of David, turned all that these conspirators did to a contrary effect. For it came to pass², that some few days after the pope had denounced excommunication against the emperor at Anagnia, going forth to refresh himself with some few accompanying him, he drank of the water of a certain well, and presently a fly entered into his mouth and stuck so fast in his throat, that by no skill of physicians it could be drawn out, till he had breathed out his last breath. Yet were not the conspirators discouraged by this accident; but after his death the greater part of cardinals chose Roland the chancellor, a professed enemy to the empire and one of the conspirators, in contempt of Frederick and the German nation (though there were some other that chose cardinal Octavian, and named him Victor). This Roland, naming himself Alexander the Third, after he came to the popedom had many dangerous conflicts with the emperor, and was oftentimes put to the worse by him, insomuch that in the end he was forced to disguise himself, and in the habit of a cook to fly to Venice, where he lived for a certain space in base condition; till in the end being known, he was honourably entertained and kindly entreated by the Venetians: which when Frederick understood of, he was greatly displeased with them for entertaining his enemy, and sent his son with a great navy and strong army, by force and violence to fetch him thence. But such was the ill hap of the young prince, that being encountered by the Venetians, he was by them taken prisoner; neither could his deliverance by any means be procured, unless Frederick would come in person to Venice, and seek to be reconciled to the pope. This hard condition the emperor yielded to for his son's sake, went to Venice in person, and was reconciled to the pope upon this condition—that he should restore to the pope the city of

¹ Psalm cix. 28.

² Naucler. Vol. II. Gener. xxxix. [p. 843.]

Rome, and whatsoever belonged to the royalty of it, and that he should do such penance as he should enjoin him: which being yielded unto, he came to the door of Saint Mark's church, and all the people looking on, the pope commanded him to prostrate himself on the ground, and to ask forgiveness, and then, treading on his neck, said, It is written, "Thou shalt go upon the asp and basilisk, and thou shalt tread upon the lion and the dragon¹:" and when Frederick said unto him, *Non tibi sed Petro cujus successor es, pareo*: that is, "I do not thus submit myself to thee, but to Peter:" the pope answered, *Et mihi et Petro*: that is, "Thou shalt do it both unto me and unto Peter." This story, so lively describing the insolency and pride of the pope, which hitherto hath gone for current, is now by certain Romanists called in question (so little do they regard their own historians, and so freely may they cast aside whatsoever standeth in their way). Howsoever, we see how mainly the popes did strive, after they had gotten a kind of civil dominion under the emperors, to cast off their yoke wholly; and, not content therewith, sought to be lords also over the emperors, and to make them acknowledge that they hold their empire from them. How and upon what occasion Leo the Third, with the consent of the people of Rome, proclaimed and anointed Charles the Great, king of France by inheritance and of Italy by conquest, and emperor of Rome, I have showed before. Yet (as Sabellicus noteth²) the opinions of men in the world were greatly altered and changed after this new inauguration; for whereas before the empire was thought to be from heaven and the gift of God, now many began to think it to be the gift of the pope³. Whereupon we read that Adrian the Fourth, upon the report of some villanies offered to the bishop of Landa in the parts of Germany, as he returned from Rome, and not so pursued, sought out, and revenged as was expected, by Frederick Barbarossa, then emperor; writeth unto him, and marvelling at his negligence in revenging wrongs offered to men of the Church, putteth him in mind what benefits he had received

¹ Psalm xci. 13.

² Sabell. Ennead. viii. Lib. viii. [Ad fin. Tom. ii. col. 598. Bas. 1560.]

³ Which Ockam, Dial. Lib. i. Tract. ii. Part. iii. proveth to be false and heretical by many reasons. [cap. 18. et sqq. p. 885. &c. apud Goldast.]

from him and the Church of Rome, as, namely, the fulness of imperial dignity and honour, and the crown appertaining thereunto; and professeth that he would have been willing to have conferred greater benefits than these upon him, knowing right well how much good he might do unto the Church¹. This letter being brought to the emperor by two cardinals, Bernard and Roland, offended the emperor and princes exceedingly, especially in that it was said in the letter that the fulness of dignity and honour was conferred upon the emperor by the pope, and that he had received the imperial crown of his hand, and that it would not grieve him if he had received greater benefits of his hand². They which heard this letter read were induced to make a strict construction of the words, and to think the pope uttered them in the sense which they conceived, because they knew well that certain Romanists had not feared to affirm that the emperors had hitherto possessed the empire of Rome and the kingdom of Italy by the pope's gift, and that they had not only uttered such words, but that by writing they had affirmed the same, and by painting lively represented it, that so it might be transmitted and sent over to posterities. For in the palace of Lateran they had painted the manner of Lotharius the emperor's receiving the crown of the pope, and written over it these words: *Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores, post homo fit papæ sumit quo dante coronam*. That is, "The king doth come before the gate, first swearing to the city's state: the pope's man then doth he become, and of his gift doth take the crown." This painting and superscription being reported to the emperor the year before, when he was near the city, by certain faithful and trusty subjects of his, greatly displeased him. But the pope, perceiving his dislike, promised that both the writing and the painting should be taken away, that it might give no occasion of contention and discord. These Romish practices making the emperor and his nobles to understand the words of the pope's letter in the worst sense, caused the message of these cardinals to be very offensive, and a general murmuring against them was heard among the princes: which growing more loud, and being

¹ Radevicus Frising. in Append. ad Othon. Lib. i. [Al. III.] cap. 9. [p. 165.]

² Ibid. cap. 10. [p. 166.]

heard and discerned by the legates, one of them adventured in the quarrel of his master to demand of whom the emperor hath his empire, if he have it not of the lord pope? Which speech of the cardinal so enraged the princes, that one of them (to wit, Otto the county palatine of Boiaria) had with his sword run him through, had not Frederick the emperor interposed his authority, and pacified the present rage. The emperor seeing in what terms things stood, took the best course he could for the security of the legates, and commanded that they should presently be had to their lodgings, and that the next morning they should be gone, and return directly to him that sent them, and not to wander up and down in the territories of bishops and abbots; and as he thus happily dispatched them away in safety, so after they were gone (providently by letters) he caused it to be made known throughout the whole empire what had passed between him and the pope. The tenor of his letters was this: "Whereas the Divine power, from which all power proceedeth both in heaven and earth, hath committed to us, his anointed, the rule of the kingdom and empire; and ordained that by imperial arms we should preserve the peace of the Churches, we are forced, not without great grief of heart, to complain unto you, that from the head of the holy Church (in which Christ imprinted the character of his peace and love) the causes of dissension, the seminary of evils, and the poison of a most pestiferous disease, do seem to flow; by means whereof, if God turn not away this evil, there is danger lest the unity betwixt the priesthood and kingdom be broken, and a schism follow. For of late, as we were in the court of Bisuntium, consulting about things concerning the honour of the empire and good of the Churches, there came unto us certain legates from the pope, who professed to bring such a message as tended greatly to the increase of the honour of the empire. But when we had the first day honourably entertained them (as the manner is), and the second day sat with our princes to hear their message, they (as it were), puffed up by reason of the mammon of iniquity, out of the height of their pride, out of the haughtiness of their arrogant minds, and out of the execrable elation of their swelling hearts, presented unto us an embassy contained in letters written by the pope, the tenor whereof was, that we should always have before the eyes of our mind in what sort the

lord pope hath conferred upon us the ensign of the imperial crown, and that yet, notwithstanding, it would no way repent him if he had done us greater favours, and we had received more benefits of him. These things not only much affected, but so moved the princes, and enraged them in such sort, that if we had not stayed them by our princely authority, the two wicked priests (the legates) had never returned alive. Wherefore, seeing they had many schedules sealed to be written in at their pleasure, by which (as formerly they were wont to do) they might scatter the poison of their iniquity throughout all the Churches of the German kingdom; make bare and naked the holy altars, and carry away with them the vessels of the house of God as a prey; that they might proceed no farther in mischief, we commanded them, without wandering or going aside, to return the same way they came. For, whereas we have our kingdom by the election of the princes from God only, who in the passion of his Son subjected the world to two swords, and the apostle Peter informed the world with the same doctrine, saying, ‘Fear God and honour the king¹;’ we are well assured, that whosoever shall say that we receive our imperial crown as a benefit from the pope, he is contrary to the institution of God, the doctrine of blessed Peter, and is a liar: and therefore our hope is, that you will not suffer the honour of the empire (which hath continued from the constitution of the city, and the institution of Christian religion, inviolable till our times) to be diminished by such unheard-of novelties and presumptuous pride. But howsoever know ye, that we will rather run into peril of death itself than suffer such a shameful confusion to fall out in our times.” After the return of the cardinals, and their complaints made, the pope wrote letters to the archbishops and bishops of Germany², telling them with what indignity the emperor dismissed his legates, and how he forbad any to come to Rome out of his kingdom; and prayed them to advise him better, and to let him know that the Church (which is builded upon a most firm and sure rock) shall continue for ever, howsoever it may be shaken with winds and tempests. The bishops of Germany having received these letters from the pope³, writ back unto him, that howsoever the Church cannot

¹ 1 Pet. ii. 17.

² Radevic. ubi supra, cap. 15. [p. 168.]

³ Cap. 16. [p. 169.]

be moved, yet they were greatly shaken by reason of these differences between him and the emperor; and tell him that the words of his letter were such as that neither the emperor and princes could endure them, nor they knew how to defend them, as being strange and unheard of before these times. Notwithstanding, they let him know, that after the receipt of his letters, they communed with the emperor about these affairs, and received from him such an answer as beseemed a catholic prince, to wit, that there are two things whereby his empire must be swayed; the laws of emperors, and the use and custom of his ancestors. These limits he is resolved not to pass, and whatsoever will not stand with these he will utterly refuse and reject: he is willing to give all due reverence unto his ghostly father, but that he ascribeth the crown of his empire to the Divine favour only, the first voice in the election to the archbishop of Mentz, and the rest to the other princes in order; that he acknowledged to have received the unction of a king from the archbishop of Coleyn, and the supreme unction, which is that of an emperor, from the pope; and that whatsoever is besides these is more than enough, and proceedeth from that which is evil; that he had not sent away the cardinals in contempt, but forbad them to proceed any further with such writings as they had, tending to the dishonour and scandal of the empire; and that he had not restrained the going of men into Italy upon necessary occasions, to be allowed by their bishops, nor simply inhibited the coming of men from thence, but that his meaning was to meet certain abuses, whereby the Churches of his kingdom had been grieved, impoverished, and oppressed; all discipline of men living retired and in cloisters utterly overthrown. Lastly, that God having exalted his Church, by means of the empire, in the head city of the world, it should not be by any means that the Church in the head city of the world should overthrow the state of the empire; that the matter began with painting, that it proceeded from painting to writing, that the writing now begins to be urged as good authority, but that he will not suffer it, nor endure it so to be, being resolved first to lose his crown before he give any consent to the abasing of the crown of the empire in such sort: and therefore requireth the paintings to be rased out, and the writings to be recalled, that such monuments of

enmity between the kingdom and the priesthood may not remain; and hereupon they beseech the pope by new letters to mollify that which was too hard, and to sweeten that which was too sour, in the former. This so wise, just, and reasonable an answer of the German bishops, prevailed so far with the pope¹, that he sent other legates of a milder spirit and better temper to the emperor, with new letters, wherein he sought to qualify whatsoever was offensive in the former; for touching that he wrote of the benefit the emperor had received of him², (which so highly displeased the emperor, supposing that he meant that he had received the imperial crown as a mere favour or good turn from him,) he answered, that however the word benefit be taken in another sense sometimes, yet he used it in that signification which it hath by original institution and first imposition. So that the word benefit, being compounded of two simple words, *bene* and *factum*, signifieth a good fact, or a thing well done, and in this sense his setting of the crown upon the emperor's head might be called a benefit, not as being a mere favour or good turn, but for that it was well and honourably done of him, to set the ensign of imperial majesty and power upon the head of him to whom such power pertained; and so were things at that time pacified by the good endeavour of the cardinals and by this mild letter of the pope. But afterwards they brake out again. Whereupon the pope wrote in this sort to the emperor³: "Adrian the bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Frederick the Roman emperor, greeting and apostolical blessing. The divine law, as it promised long life to them that honour their parents, so doth it pronounce the sentence of death against them that curse father or mother. For we are taught by the voice of truth, that whosoever exalteth himself shall be brought low. Wherefore, son beloved in the Lord, we do not a little marvel that you seem not to give so much reverence to blessed Peter and to the holy Church of Rome as you ought to do. For in your letters written to us you put your name before ours; wherein you incur the note of insolency, that I say not arrogancy. What shall I say of the fealty you promised and sware to blessed Peter? how do you observe it, when you require of

¹ Cap. 17. [p. 169.]

² Cap. 22. [p. 171.]

³ Appendix vetusti scriptoris ad Radevicum in fine hist. Othonis Frisingensis: Naucler. Vol. II. Gener. xxxix. [p. 839.]

them who are gods, and the sons of the Most High, to wit bishops, the doing of homage unto you, and exact fealty of them, inclosing their sacred hands in your hands, and manifestly opposing yourself against us, shut not only the doors of the churches, but the gates of the cities of your kingdom also, against our cardinals sent as legates unto you from our own side? Repent, repent therefore, we advise thee: of us thou receivedst thy consecration, and therefore take heed lest, affecting things denied unto thee, thou lose that which is yielded to thee." To this letter of the pope the worthy emperor answered in this sort¹: "Frederick by the grace of God emperor of Romans, to Adrian bishop of the catholic Church, wishing unto him a firm adhering and cleaving to all those things which Jesus began to do and speak. The law of justice giveth to every one that which is his own. Neither do we offend in this behalf; for we derogate nothing from our parents, but give unto them in this our imperial state all due honour, to wit, to those our noble progenitors, from whom we received the dignity of our kingdom, and our crown, and not from the pope. Had Sylvester bishop of Rome any thing pertaining to royal state and dignity in the time of Constantine? was not liberty restored to the Church, and peace, by his means? And hath not your popedom received all such royal dignities as it now enjoyeth from princes? And why then is it so much disliked, that when we write unto the bishop of Rome, by ancient right, and after the old manner, we put our name before his, and according unto the rule of justice, permit him writing unto us to do the like? Turn over the histories and monuments of antiquity, and if you have not yet observed it, you shall there find that which we avouch; and why should we not require homage and the performance of other duties due from subjects to princes, of them who are gods by adoption, and yet think it no disparagement to hold things pertaining to our royal state? especially, seeing he who was author and beginner both of your dignity and ours, who never received any thing of any mortal king, but gave all good things unto all, paid tribute unto Cæsar for himself and Peter, and gave you an example to do the like. Either therefore let them put from them the things they hold of us, or if they think it behooveful to retain and keep them still, let them

¹ Ibidem.

yield unto God the things that are God's, and to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. The doors of our churches and the gates of our cities are shut against your cardinals, because we find them not to be preachers, but men desirous of a prey; not confirmers of peace, but polling companions to get money; not such as come to repair the breaches of the world, but greedily and insatiably to gather gold. But whensoever we shall see them such as the Church requireth them to be, men bringing peace, enlightening their country, assisting the cause of those of mean degree in equity and right, they shall want nothing that is necessary for them. To conclude, when you thus contend about things little pertaining to religion, and strive with secular persons about titles of honour, you seem to have forgotten that humility which is the keeper of all virtues, and that meekness that should be in you. Let your fatherhood therefore take heed, lest while you move questions about things unworthy to be stood upon, you scandalize them who with attentive ear listen to the words of your mouth, and wait for your speeches as for the latter rain. We are forced thus to write unto you, because we see the detestable beast of pride hath crept up even to the seat of Peter. Provide always well for the peace of the Church, and fare you always well." Thus we see how the popes, not contenting themselves with the fulness of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, though they had no just title unto it, proceeded yet further; and partly by the favour of Christian princes, and partly by fraud and violence, got to be great princes in the world, and stayed not till they made challenge to be over the mightiest emperors, and to dispose of their crowns and dignities. So showing themselves to have the perfect mark and character of him of whom the apostle speaketh; "Who sitteth in the temple of God as God, and is lifted up above all that is called God¹." Yet could they not so prevail in these their hellish practices, nor so carry away the truth of God, and the liberty of his Church into captivity, but that there were ever found both Christian emperors and learned divines to resist them in their unjust claims.

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 4.

The first of these is the fact that the United States is a young nation, and that its history is a history of growth and expansion. The second is the fact that the United States is a nation of immigrants, and that its history is a history of the struggle for assimilation and the creation of a new American identity. The third is the fact that the United States is a nation of diverse peoples, and that its history is a history of the struggle for equality and the recognition of the rights of all citizens. The fourth is the fact that the United States is a nation of great power, and that its history is a history of the struggle for world peace and the establishment of a new international order. The fifth is the fact that the United States is a nation of great ideals, and that its history is a history of the struggle for the realization of these ideals. The sixth is the fact that the United States is a nation of great achievements, and that its history is a history of the struggle for progress and the betterment of the human condition. The seventh is the fact that the United States is a nation of great challenges, and that its history is a history of the struggle for survival and the preservation of the American way of life. The eighth is the fact that the United States is a nation of great hopes, and that its history is a history of the struggle for a brighter future and a more just society. The ninth is the fact that the United States is a nation of great dreams, and that its history is a history of the struggle for the fulfillment of the American dream. The tenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of great faith, and that its history is a history of the struggle for the realization of the American dream.

BOUND BY
JOSIAH WESTLEY,
ADJOINING "THE TIMES" OFFICE
LONDON.











Field, Richard

Of the Church, five Books

Bd.: 3

Cambridge 1850

Polem. 983 m-3

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10773515-0